Quarterly Vol. XVI. Part III

THE
JOURNAL
OF
ORIENTAL RESEARCH
MADRAS

(Founded by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, M.A.)

March 1947

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE, MYLAPORE
MADRAS

PRINTED AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS, MYLAPORE
1948

Annual Subs., Inland, Rs. 8. Foreign, 14 Shillings.

Each part separately Rupees Two, Postage inclusive

CONTENTS

VOL. XVI] [PART III

	PAGES
The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute ...	119—120
Samskrit in Greater India by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri ...	121—128
The Art of Śrīmad Bhāgavata by N. Raghunathan.	129—140
The Later Days of Bhoja the Great by Vedam Venkataraya Sastri ...	141—150
Puṇyakṣetra by Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra ...	151—154
Kṛṣṇa III and the Cedis by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri ...	155—158
Allahabad Pillar Inscription Verses 4 and 8 by Dr. V. Raghavan ...	159—162
Book Review ...	163—164
Obituary Notice ...	165
SUPPLEMENTS:	
Tolkāppiyam—Poruḷ—Akattiṇai by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri ...	19— 26
Avantisundarīkathāsāra edited by G. Harihara Sastri.	9— 16

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE

A meeting of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute was held on Tuesday, April 6, 1948 at the Ranade Hall, Mylapore, under the presidency of Rao Bahadur Dr. S. K. Belvalkar of Poona.

After prayer, Dr. C. Kunhan Raja read verses composed by himself specially for the occasion eulogising the services of Dr. Belvalkar to Sanskrit. Sri T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, President of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, in welcoming Dr. Belvalkar, and inviting him to take the chair, paid a tribute to Poona for its great reputation for scholarship and to Dr. Belvalkar for his work in the cause of Sanskrit culture and literature.

Dr. V. Raghaven, Secretary of the Institute, read messages received for the success of the function from H. E. M. S. Aney, Governor of Bihar, the Raja Saheb of Aundh and the Ganganath Jha Research Institute.

Sri K. Balasubramania Iyer, Secretary of the Institute, presented a short report of the work of the Institute for the period 1-9-47 to 31-3-48. He said that the members of the Institute were very glad to have Dr. Belvalkar in their midst, as it was he who prominently mentioned the idea of founding a Research Institute in the name of the late Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri in his Presidential Address to the Benares session of the All-India Oriental Conference. He appealed to all lovers of culture throughout the country to take an interest in the work of Institute and encourage it by becoming its Life Members, Fellows or Patrons.

Dr. S. K. Belvalkar in the course of his introductory remarks, mentioned how in 1919, at the First All-India Oriental Conference at Poona, he, the late Mms. Kuppuswamy Sastri and Ganganath Jha had met and discussed how best they could stabilise and continue Research work, and he was gratified today to find two Research Institutes in Madras and Allahabad in the name of those two scholars. Stressing the need for more work, Dr. Belvalkar appealed to friends and lovers of culture to come forward and help liberally the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute. Referring to the role

of research and Sanskrit,the Professor said that they revealed the ancient glory of Bhārata Varṣa. He declared that the study and development of Sanskrit literature was essential to to preserve the unity of Akhaṇḍa Bhārata.

Then Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri and Sri N. Raghunatha Iyer delivered two lectures on Sanskrit in Greater India and the Art of the Bhagavata. The texts of these two lectures are reproduced elsewhere in this issue.

In his concluding remarks, Prof. Belvalkar laid emphasis again on the unifying influence of Sanskrit. He hoped the day would not be far off when, as in the Universities of Taxila and Nalanda of old, Sanskrit would become the medium of instruction in our Universities. Considering how a totally foreign language like English had succeeded in this sphere, he said there should be no difficulty in Sanskrit resuming its great role of cultural unification of India.

Sri K. Balasubramanya Iyer thanked the President and the two lecturers.

SAMSKRIT IN GREATER INDIA

By

Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri

The part played by language in shaping human society, and its culture, has been defined once for all by one of the most famous of our rhetoricians, Daṇḍī, in his *Kāvyādarśa*. He says :

> Idam andham tamaḥ kṛtsnam jāyeta bhuvanatrayam
> Yadi śabdāhvayam Jyotir-āsamsāram na dīpyate

I would only say that the expression *āsamsāram* must be understood both in a spacial and temporal sense. He was thinking primarily of Samskrit in making that statement. That statement is, however, sufficiently general to cover all languages which would have included what he would have called Samskṛta and Prākṛta. The view which says Prakṛti is Samskṛta and Prākṛta is derived from it, is a concoction that does credit to the heart of the man who put it forward, because he revered Samskrit with more enthusiasm than with a knowledge of proper linguistic development. The proper view is, as you all know, that Prākṛta is the natural speech and Samskṛta is, if I may so put it, sublimated speech, the literary dialect. I will merely indicate the lines of thought I pursue and not seek to expatiate on them, as I do not think it is necessary to do that to a learned audience like this. This question arises : Was Samskrit ever spoken ? Different views have been held on the subject. I would only say that if you peruse the Avadānas of Buddhist literature or the early Bhāṣyas like the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali, or that of Śabarasvāmin on the Mīmāmsā-sūtras, the conclusion is apparent enough that Samskṛta, for all its 'artificiality', must have been spoken very widely at one time. It was only the other day at the Samskrit Sammelan that we saw some very learned pandits handling Samskrit with a facility which we all envied, and today you had a set of elegant verses from Dr. Kunhan Raja which show how well we can use Samskrit for our purposes. I would only draw your attention particularly to the very effective pun on Duśśāsana, comparing the danger to Samskrit studies to the fate that befell Draupadī in the

Sabhā of the Kauravas.[1]

Now, in our part of the country there is a notion that Samskrit is a Brahmin language. Well, it simply is not that. In the development of Samskrit and the whole body of its literature men of all classes have taken part, as well in authorship as in its study and propagation. Large sections of Samskrit literature are exclusively devoted to popular education, particularly the Purāṇas. How can you say that this language was intended only to serve the narrow purposes of an exclusive class ? Is Tamil, as is often claimed, again the exclusive property of those who are not Brahmins ? Here again facts are against the view. Tamil legends claim Agastya as its founder. But that apart, some of the greatest Tamil poets from the earliest times have been Brahmins. Tolkāppiyar was a Brahmin, and Kapilar of the Śangam Age for instance was another ; besides twenty-eight others more or less contemporary with him. The most famous commentators in the field of Tamil literature like Parimēlaḻagar and Naccinārkkiniyar, described as "*pulavargaḷ uccimēṟkoḷḷum*" (acclaimed by scholars as their head) were Brahmins. Hence Tamil literature owes a lot to Brahmins.

Yet another view known in this part of the country is that Tamil, unlike other Indian languages, is free from Samskrit influence. Again facts are against the notion. Here I will take permission to indicate my own experience. I was a student of Samskrit at school and college. But the desire to learn Tamil was in me and I started learning Tamil literature after I became a teacher and my teacher was one of the most famous Tamil scholars in those days, Śrī Subrahmaṇya Kavirāyar of Melagaram. I started with the *Villiputtūrar Bhārataṃ*, a work replete with Samskrit influence and vocabulary. I will give you one instance that comes to my mind. One verse began like this :

> Purātanāgama-vēda-gīta-purāṇa-rūpam oḷittu veṅ
> Kirātanāgiya vaḍivu koṇḍa giriśanōḍ-urai śeyguvān.

The next work I took up for study was *Pattuppāṭṭu* the first song of which was : *Tirumurug-āṟṟuppaḍai.*

---

1. दुर्दैवाभिभवात्प्रनष्टविभवा पाञ्चालपुत्री यथा
गैर्वाणी विविधैश्छलैः परजनैः स्थानात्स्वकाच्च्याविता ।
सा दुश्शासनदूषिता प्रियजनैस्सार्धं च निर्वासिता
देशदद्य तु काननैकशरणा यानोन्मुखीवेक्ष्यते ॥

The first word of it was *Ulagam* (Skt. loka). I asked my teacher if this word was Tamil ; was it not Sanskrit ? He said, "No, this is a Tamil word and not Sanskrit". I said, "very good" and we passed on. I had hardly done sixteen lines when in the eighteenth line occurred the phrase :

nāvaloḍu peyariya polam-bunai-yavir-iḷai.

Of course this is good Tamil. There is no Sanskrit word in it. But how do you get this ? Obviously it is a Tamil rendering of Samskrit Jāmbūnada, the name for the purest gold. In another verse there is mention of a Pāṇḍya King by name Palyāgaśālai Mudukuḍumi Peruvaḷudi, the first title meaning 'Of the many sacrificial halls'. Elsewhere, Avvai, the Śangam poetess, compares the three kings of the Tamil country to the three sacred fires of the Brahmins.

Irupiṟappāḷar
Muttīp-puraiyak-kāṇḍagav-virunda
Koṟṟa-veṇkuḍaik-koḍittēr vēndir

Yet another poet in describing how his followers behaved when they very presented a large number of jewels by a rich patron to whom they had gone for patronage, says, "My followers being poor folk, did not know how to use what they got." It seems they put on their ear ornaments meant for the fingers, and the finger ornaments on their ears ; they put on their neck ornaments intended for the waist and *viceversa.* The poet compares their action with that of the monkeys that found Sītā's jewels which she dropped when Rāvaṇa carried her away. Here are his lines.

Kaḍunderi-Rāman-uḍan puṇar Sītaiyai
valittagaiy-arakkan vauviya-ñāṉṟai
nilañ-jēr madar-aṇi kaṇḍa kurangin
śemmugap-peruṇgilaiyiḷaip-polindā angu

These illustrations are taken from times earlier than which there is no written Tamil in existence. They are thus from the earliest stratum of Tamil literature to which we have access today. Who can say that that literature is free from Samskrit influence ? If you take a later poem like the *Śilappadikāram* you will see that in the section called Āycciyar Kuravai (the shepherdess' dance) the entire mythology of the Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata, and of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's childhood is handled with the utmost freedom and literary charm, with the implication that it was part of the folk lore of the Tamil land. I have no time to go into more details. The real truth of the matter is that Tamil, as we know it, does not contain

a single line of literature that ante-dates its contact with Samskrit influences. All honour to it. I do not say this to detract from its merit. I say it merely to emphasise what our President, Dr. S. K. Belvalkar, has so clearly put forward to-day that Samskrit is the pivot of our whole culture and to show that Tamil culture is no exception to the rule. There is great need to day for us to recapture the live contact with our classics and to go to the deep-lying roots from which this great culture has grown in the past and is bound to grow in the future. When I consider all this, I am persuaded that there is much more than strikes at first sight in the views put forward by the H. E. Kailasnath Katju, the Governor of Orissa, and endorsed by Dr. C. R. Reddi, the Vice-Chancellor of the Andhra University more recently, that Samskrit should be made the State language of the Indian Union.

But my subject today is Samskrit in Greater India and you may wonder what all this has got to do with that subject. The answer is that in Greater India Samskrit played the same role that it has been playing for ages in our country. It brought culture to the Prākrit languages of those localities. What are the localities that I am primarily having in mind ? I am thinking of the whole of the Indo-China Peninsula and Indonesia right up to Borneo including the Philippines. Strictly speaking Greater India included even places in East Africa and Central Asia, but I am not bringing those places within the scope of my discourse on Greater India to-day. Now it is a French Archeaologist Dr. G. Coedes, who has observed that it is because of this close contact with Hindu culture which these lands enjoyed in ancient times that their ancient history interests us much more than for instance the ancient history of Australia or New Guinea. What interest we have in the past of this land is due to the work done by Hindu culture and Samskrit. Samskrit was the language of the Court and of culture, and of the public documents including the numberless inscriptions which still survive, and justify unmistakably our estimate of the role of Samskrit here. The local idioms of every one of these places become charged with Samskrit words; and the Samskrit language of the inscriptions and literature of those lands borrowed quite freely from the local languages whenever there was necessity to do so. I shall read a few lines from the ealiest Malay inscriptions from Śrī Vijaya in Sumatra. It is a mixture of Samskrit and old Malay ;

> Svasti Śrī Śakavarṣātīta 605 ekādaśi śuklapakṣa
> vulan vaiśākha dapunta hiyam nayik
> disamvu manalap siddhiyātrā di saptami
> śuklapakṣa vulan jyeṣṭha dapunta..

I told you that Samskrit borrowed where necessary from the local dialects. I will give you one illustration, again from another inscription, this time from Java, It mentions the designations of local officials which are not of Samskrit origin. It is a beautiful Anuṣṭhup verse :

> Paṅkura-tavāna-tīripa nāmabhir ādeśaśastribhī rājñaḥ
> Tārā bhavanam kāritam idamapi cāpyārya bhikṣūnām

In fact there was a parallel evolution both in India and in the colonies in epigraphy. In India our earliest inscriptions are in Prākṛt, then we have Samskrit, and still later inscriptions are usually bilingual, in both Samskrit and the local language. In the colonies we miss the first phase.

The most important relics of Hindu influences in these lands are the stone inscriptions which tell us quite a lot about the role Samskrit played in the development of their culture. I have already given instances and will give just a few more. There have heen found seven stone Yūpas each of which bears an inscription in Samskrit in the eastern part of the island of Borneo. These records speak of a king by name Mūlavarman who is stated to have conqured many lands and subjugated them like Yudhiṣṭhira, and Mūlavarman's father was Aśvavarman ; his grandfather was Kundunga, not an Indian or Samskrit name. Mūlavarman performed many sacrifices and made large gifts, mentioned in the yūpas, like Bahusuvarṇaka, Gosahasra, Jaladhenu, Tiladhenu, Vṛṣabhaikādaśa and so on. Some of these inscriptions conclude with the statement; "*Yūpo'yaṁ sthāpito viprair nānā-deśādihāgataiḥ.*" In the law and society of the ancient times of those lands the influence of Manu and Kauṭilya is quite unmistakably seen, and that influence still continues in the island of Bali where Hindu culture is preserved to this day in a small way. Dr. Stutterheim in his book on Bali says that to-day 7 per cent of the people of Bali belong to what they call Trivamśa meaning Brahma, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya. The rest of them call themselves Kaula or Śūdra. The sociology of these lands was practically regulated for all time on the lines of Indian sociology. In literature and art the influence again is unmistakable. Works like Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, Amarmālā, Arjuna-vivāha, and Kṛṣṇāyana are found there. In the region

of art and architecture, I have only to mention the names of Bara Budur, Prambanan and Angkor Vat for you to recall the superb achievements of the colonies, achievements which, while they were based on a through acquaintance with Indian models, in many ways left them far behind in boldness of conception and the perfection of finish in the execution. These great monuments and many other smaller ones which I need not mention here by name show how Buddhism and Hinduism, Śaivaism and Vaiṣṇavism all worked together in creating the culture of those distant lands. I do not know what the position is to-day after the recent upheavals, but till very recently there were court-Brahmins at Phnom Penh in Cambodia and at Bangkok in Siam who were Buddhists with the *śikhā* and the *upavīta*; they had many old icons in their charge including Gaṇeśa and Naṭarāja, and chanted the Ākom (Āgama) on ceremonial occasions like the coronation of a monarch. Again even to-day the Muslim merchants of Malaya and elsewhere write "chiri" at the top of the letters they despatch. It is really "Śrī". The Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata and the Harivamśa as well as the Purāṇas furnish to this day the subject-matter of the stories that are staged in the theatres, the songs that are rendered in dance and the themes presented in the shadow plays and marionette shows throughout Indo-china and Indonesia. To quote again the French archæologist whom I have already referred to, Dr. Coedes : "From one end of Further India to the other spectators still continue to weep over the tribulations of Rāma and Sītā."

In these remarks, on a very vast subject, I have sought not to deal with it exhaustively—that could not be done in one lecture, but would need a series of lectures—but to give you a sufficiently clear idea of the place Samskrit occupied in these lands in the past. It is not very different from what it has been in our own country. I would enforce this, by reading with your leave a few extracts from one or two typical inscriptions to show the high style of Samskrit attained by the poets of the colonies who composed these inscriptions and with that I will close. Here is an inscription of the early 7th century from Kambuja :

Rājā śrī Bhava-varmeti patirāsīnmahībhṛtām
apradhṛṣya mahāsatvaḥ tungo Merurivāparaḥ

Outside Kālidāsa, where can you get such verse ? I will read a little more of that inscription and give another, also from Kambuja of the 9th century, the date is A. D. 877.

Somānvaye prasūtasya somasyeva payonidhau I
Kenāpi yasya tejastu jājvalīti sadāhave II
antas samutthā durgrāhyā mūrtyabhāvād atīndriyāḥ I
yadā ṣaḍarayo yena jitā bāhyeṣu kā kathā II
nityadāna-payassikta-karāneva matangajān I
ātmānukārādiva yaḥ samarāya samagrahīt II

and so on through many more such fine verses. And now to the other inscription of the ninth century. It begins :

śrī siddhi svasti jaya namaḥ parameśvarāya
niṣkalāya svabhāvena
svecchayā dhṛtamūrttaye I
śivāya parameśāya
namo' stu paramātmane II
yenaikenāpy anekeṣu
tiṣṭhatā yugapat pṛthak I
ātmāpi kriyate nityam
tasmai śūlabhṛte namḥ II
navarandhrādrirājyasthas
so' bhavat kamvujeśvaraḥ I
śrīndravarmā trivarggeṇa
varddhayan harṣayan prajāḥ II
rājñī rājaparamparoditavatī śrīrudravarmmātmajā
rājaśrīnṛpatīndravarmmatanayā jātā satī yābhavat I
patnī śrīpṛthivīndravarmmanṛpateḥ kṣatrānvayāptodgates
tasyā bhūmipatis suto nṛpanato yaś śrīndravarmmāhvayaḥ II

Omitting some verses, we may note the following in the description of the King :

dvayam kathannu samlakṣyam
iti dhātrā yadānanam I
vidhāya bhedabuddhyartham
mṛgāṇko nūnam ankitaḥ II
adhyāste yasya hṛdayam
naiva kāmo nirantaram I
tatsannihitacandrārddha—
cūḍāmaṇibhayādiva II
kṣirodasāramathanād
āharantam śriyam harim I
jahāseva prabhūtaśrīr
yyo bhūbhṛnmathanena tu II
viśālàtvān nivasana—
kṣame vakṣasi saty api I
laulyādiva dhruvam yasya
lakṣmīs sarvvāṅgacāriṇī II
....
....
yena saundaryyavijito
jātalajja iva dhruvam I
līno manasi lokānām
adyāpi makaradhvajaḥ II

The purpose of the inscription is stated thus :

candravyomavasūpalakṣitaśake māghasya yāmye dine
śukle kumbhavṛṣāntataulamakarālyabjājagehāgate I
sūryyādau pratimās svaśilparacitā īśasya devyāś ca tāḥ
tisras sthāpitavān bhave vṛṣagate sa śrīndravarmmā samam II

Then follow the verses describing the King's gifts to the temple, a list of the temple's equipment so to say, and the conclusion contains the usual imprecation against those who misappropriate the charities and benediction in favour of those who protect them :

tena rājendrasinhena
samrājā śrīndravarmmaṇā ।
tāni sarvvāṇi dattāni
devatāsv āsu bhaktitaḥ ॥
śivikā ātapatrāṇi
sauvarṇṇā rājatā ghaṭāḥ ।
vicitrarūpā vahavo
hṛdyā viracitās tathā ॥
rājatāḥ pṛthukumbhāś ca
rājatavyajanāni ca ।
karaṅkā hāṭakā raupyās
svarṇṇarūpyasamudgakāḥ ॥
bhājanāni ca raupyāṇi
yajñakośāš ca rājatāḥ ।
sauvarṇṇakośakhaḍgāś ca
ratnāny ābharaṇāni ca ॥
hemarūpyapadādarśā
vālavyajankāni ca ।
gandhadravyāṇi sarvvāṇi
kārpūraprabhrtīni ca ॥
pharās suvarṇṇaracitā
rūpyālankrtatomarāḥ ॥
vastrāṇi ca vicitrāṇi
sarvvopakaraṇāni ca ॥
narttakyaśśobhanā bahvyo
gāyanyo vādikās tathā ।
viṇādivādyavādinyo
veṇutāla—viśāradāḥ ॥
puruṣā rūpiṇaś ślāghyā
narttanādiviśāradāḥ ।
bahavaś cāruveṣāś ca
sabhūṣaṇaparicchadāḥ ॥
naranārīsahasrāṇi
vahūni vahuvṛttayaḥ ।
vahugrāmāś ca vistīrṇṇā
kedārārāmamanḍalāḥ ॥
gavām vahusahasrāṇi
mahiṣāś chāgalā api ।
dviradendrās sagaṇikā
bahavas turagās tathā ॥
ye lobhād āhariṣyanti
dattāni śrīndravarmmaṇā ।
te yāntu narakam ghoram
yāvac candradivākarau ॥
ye tu samvarddhayiṣyanti
śraddhayā parayā yutāḥ ।
vasantu te śivapade
yāvac candradivākarau ॥

THE ART OF ŚRĪMAD BHĀGAVATA

BY

N. RAGHUNATHAN

I realise that in choosing the subject of this evening I may find myself between two fires. There are those who will consider it almost blasphemy to talk of one of the great scriptures of the world in terms of art; for art to-day has a purely secular significance. There are others who will contend, again from the modern view-point, that there is little conscious art in the Bhāgavata. In reply to the first school, whose views I shall consider in some detail later, I shall now content myself with pointing out that the prohibition काव्यालापांश्च वर्जयेत् was never intended to apply to an Itihāsa like the Rāmāyaṇa or a Purāṇa like the Bhāgavata whose subject is the *Uttama-śloka.*

Those who object that there is little art in the Bhāgavata may be able to make out a case which at first sight seems formidable. The Devil's Advocate will point out that the long rambling story is in reality only a series of episodes loosely fitted into the Purāṇic pattern under the conventional divisions. He will contend, further, that there is no unity of theme, that the story, such as it is, is interrupted again and again to introduce a hymn of prayer and praise which, however edifying, does not add to the interest of the plot, and that the laws of the spatio-temporal world are cavalierly set at naught. He will point out that the anuṣṭubh often limps, and that Śuka Brahmam is particularly fond of those peculiar moods and tenses of which Samskrit has an embarrassing profusion. Vopadeva, we are told, has, in his unpublished work *Paramahamsapriyā*, established that the Bhāgavata contains more than one thousand archaic forms not sanctioned by the grammarians. And it is hardly necessary to add that the Bhāgavata is unashamedly didactic—surely the supreme sin in the eyes of our modern literati!

To those who take this line, I would only say, "Read the Bhāgavata not once or twice but again and again. Remember that it has long been prescribed as a *pārāyaṇa grantha.* It may be that you are not interested in its frequent disquisitions

on the Sānkhya, that your taste reared on Macaulay rebels against the seas of butter and oceans of treacle in which Śuka revels. No matter. Read the work all the same, not skipping even these long and, to the beginner, dreary stretches. You will find that in time the book grows upon you." The Bhāgavata is undoubtedly an acquired taste. But once it gets hold of you, it is difficult to shake off its fascination. The more your mind feeds on it the less it comes to like conventional works of art. For, unlike them, it appeals to a layer of consciousness far deeper than that in which the aesthetic sense is located.

Art in India is traditionally non-representational in character, just as art in Europe was before the Renaissance. It does not simply imitate Nature, as St. Thomas Aquinas pointed out; "it imitates Nature in her manner of operation." The *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa* says, "It is by the imitation of *daivic* works of art that every work of art is accomplished here, whether it be a clay elephant, an object of brass, an article of clothing, an object of gold or a mule chariot." European critics, under the guidance of such great scholars as our own Dr. Ananda Coomaraswamy and the French savant Rene Guenon, are now coming increasingly to recognise this truth. So far as Indian iconography is concerned, we no longer hear those facile denunciations of gods with eight arms and three eyes as unnatural monstrosities—which was the stock response a quarter of a century ago. But Western understanding of our epics and Purāṇas is still largely unable to get over these hurdles presented by the senses. The fact, however, is that the Bhāgavata is a work of art in precisely the same way in which the great icon of Śiva Naṭarāja is a work of art and is put by the bhakta to precisely the same use—as a support for meditation. The common tradition that our Itihāsas have their originals laid up in Heaven is worth considering in this connection. Vālmīki is supposed to have adapted to our human understanding the Brahma-kṛta Rāmāyaṇa, शत कोटि प्रविस्तरम्. The Bhāgavata on the other hand is the mighty banyan tree that has grown from the seed sown by the Lord in the four verses in the second Skandha beginning अहमेवासमेवाग्रे... . It grew in two parallel lines. The two streams of tradition, to vary the metaphor, poured their store of waters into the Mānasa Lake which is

the mind of Śuka, there to provide perennial refreshment to the questing soul.

The work of art is a support for meditation because it is itself the result of meditation. ध्यात्वा कुर्यात् is the injunction that the artist must follow. The Rāmāyaṇa and the Bhāgavata are alike the result of yogic vision. धर्मेणावेक्षते गतिम् gives the key to our understanding of Vālmīki's great work. And Bhakti-yoga is the key to the Bhāgavata;

भक्तियोगेन मनसि सम्यक् प्रणिहितेऽमले ।
अपश्यत्पुरुषं पूर्वं मायां च तदुपाश्रयाम् ॥

You will find in the Bhāgavata many overtones, echoes and even positive reminiscences from the Rāmāyaṇa, to one or two of which I may have occasion to refer. There is nothing surprising in this, for Śuka pays magnificent tribute to the Rāmāyaṇa. But it would be not only silly to suppose him guilty of plagiarism, it would reveal a basic inability to understand the poetic process. The Itihāsas, all of them, draw from the common body of myths and legends which constitute the memory of the race. But, if the resemblances are striking, the differences are even more remarkable. That is due to the fact that the focussing lens which projects the poet's vision on the consciousness of the reader is different in each case. Vālmīki's dominant preoccupation is with Dharma, Śuka's with Bhakti. Śrī Rāma is Righteousness incarnate, Śrī Kṛṣṇa is Beauty incarnate. The *rasas* evoked in the mind of the reader who puts himself *en rapport* are correspondingly different. Our response in the one case is a heightened sense of reverence, in the other an ecstasy of delight.

While the Bhāgavata is traditionally attributed to Vyāsa, it is in a special sense the creation of Śuka. The dramatic scene in which the sage makes his entry in the first Skandha sets the key to the whole story. The Lord has withdrawn from the earthly scene to live with us for ever in his भागवतीतनु. It is this enchanting picture of the eternal Kṛṣṇa that the great artist builds up stroke by stroke against the sulphurous storm-tossed background of a world in dissolution. On this glorious figure he lavishes all the delicacy of his spiritual perception, all his wealth of poetic imagination. He plunges ever and anon into the depths of the Self and

returns bringing with him handfuls of pearl. He is charmingly grateful to Parīkṣit for keeping the image of the Lord ever new in his heart by his questions:

सतामयं सारभृतां निसर्गो
यदर्थवाणीश्रुतिचेतसामपि ।
प्रतिक्षणं नव्यवदच्युतस्य यत्
स्त्रिया विटानामिव साधुवार्ता ॥

The sage speaks as one in a dream; for the cosmic consciousness possesses him quite. वासुदेवे भगवति निमग्नहृदयोऽब्रवीत्: that is the fitting prelude to the narration of Kuchela's story, one of the grand peaks of the Bhāgavata.

It will not have escaped the confirmed novel reader that Vālmīki and Śuka do not bother to give us anything like a photographic delineation of the physical aspects of their respective heroes. The descriptions are, of course, many and frequent. But they are not particularised. To the casual reader they look like permutations and combinations of the *Sāmudrika lakṣaṇas*. Let us look at the divine children as they presented themselves to Akrūra's hungry eyes:

किशोरौ श्यामलश्वेतौ श्रीनिकेतौ बृहद्भुजौ ।
सुमुखौ सुन्दरवरौ बालद्विरदविक्रमौ ॥

You are inevitably reminded of the entranced description of the other Divine pair as Janaka the *jīvanmukta* sees them:

इमौ कुमारौ भद्रं ते देवतुल्यपराक्रमौ ।
गजसिंहगती वीरौ शार्दूलवृषभोपमौ ॥

Here is no minute cataloguing of the features of the face, of the peculiarities of the torso. From this it must not be supposed that Rāma and Kṛṣṇa were bloodless abstractions. Śrī Kṛṣṇa at least had enough distinguishing marks, we read, for his consorts to realise, though with some difficulty, that Pradyumna, who was the very spit and image of his father, as the saying goes, was in fact not Śrī Kṛṣṇa but a different person. The only reference to a physical peculiarity of Śrī Rāma's that Valmīki makes, if my memory serves me right, is in the description of that glorious right hand on which he rested his head when soliciting the aid of Samudra Rāja. The poet speaks of it as ज्याघातविगतत्वचम् ;

the reference is to the peeling off of the skin from the constant beat of the bowstring. Curiously enough, this is mentioned in the case of Śrī Kṛṣṇa too. When He along with Arjuna and Bhīma goes disguised to seek the boon of battle of Jarāsandha, that astute warrior detects the Kṣatriya behind the Brahmanical cloak from this identical mark, among other things: प्रकोष्ठैर्ज्याहतैरपि । Thus, apart from what you might call an occupational mark, there is nothing indicated by which the reader can make a mental picture of these *avatāra puruṣas.* There is the colour, of course, especially the intriguing श्यामल of Śrī Rāmacandra and the rather darker shade of Kṛṣṇa. "Imagine a green man!"—the votary of naturalistic art will shout in derision. But Śuka unabashed says:

दिशो वितिमिरा राजन् कुर्वाणौ प्रभया स्वया ।
यथा मारकतश्शैलो रौप्यश्च कनकाचितौ ॥

That shimmering glory of emerald and milk-white set against the golden glow of sunset is a light that never was on land or sea. Thus the poet communicates to you the vision of gods in human form:

यदृच्छयेव गां प्राप्तौ देवलोकादिवामरौ ।

Not otherwise can more than mortal beauty and power be conveyed.

At the close of the Daśama Skandha and as the crown of it we are vouchsafed a vision of the Bhūma Puruṣa—Viṣṇu with eight arms and a thousand lovely curls—who welcomes Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna as his own manifestations.

पुष्ट्या श्रिया कीर्त्यजयाखिलर्द्धिभिः
निषेव्यमाणं परमेष्ठिनां पतिम् ।
ववन्द आत्मानमनन्तमच्युतो
जिष्णुश्च तद्दर्शनजातसाध्वसः ॥

In regard to this transcendental vision Vopadeva in his *Muktāphala* has a *sūtra*: नेदगेव इच्छारूपत्वात्: which his commentator expands somewhat as follows: "It may be asked, 'If this is indeed the appearance of Viṣṇu, then how is it that elsewhere He is differently described as having four arms, and so on?' The reply is that the Lord, who is without Nāma and Rūpa, assumes just those appearances which the bhaktas,

each according to his preference, would like to cherish." And for this statement explicit authority is to be found in the Bhāgavata itself, in the Brahmastuti in the third Skandha:

त्वं भावयोगपरिभावितहृत्सरोज
आस्से श्रुतेक्षितपथो ननु नाथ पुंसाम् ।
यद्यद्धिया त उरुगाय विभावयन्ति
तत्तद्वपुः प्रणयसे तदनुग्रहाय ॥

and again:

तान्येव तेऽभिरूपाणि रूपाणि भगवंस्तव ।
यानि यानि च रोचन्ते स्वजनानामरूपिणः ॥

Now, the reader will be better able to realise the significance of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's being depicted in the Bhāgavata as moving about the world, now in the guise of a normal man, now as a divine being with four hands holding the mace, the discus, and so on. The aim of the poet obviously is to make this central truth—that the Lord is as the devotee conceives Him in the core of his heart—part of the reverent reader's psychology, and to give him a fit object of meditation while at the same time familiarising him with the concept of God as not something unapproachable and unknowable but as the Inspirer within and the all-pervading Benevolence without us. The Kṛṣṇa of the Bhāgavata is no anthropomorphic creation. The ambition of Vālmīki and Śuka alike is to show God walking this earth of ours. But, whereas Śri Rāma lives like a man to show the way of perfection, Śrī Kṛṣṇa shows that God can consort with men by unbending to them. The ascent of man and the descent of Grace complete the cycle of experience which is the Cosmic Purpose.

Looked at this way, the numerous miracles of the Bhāgavata, particularly the Daśama Skandha, fall pat into their place. Miracles would hardly seem miraculous if they were not so infrequent. We talk for days on end of a strange light that appeared in the Northern sky; but we hardly devote a thought to the daily miracle of fruit and flower, the bloom of health on children's cheeks, the mysterious stirring of affection in hearts that were indifferent. It is the great poet who can give you beauty on the wing; to give an example from profane literature, there is the brilliant description by Mahāśvetā of the advent of her own youth.

क्रमेण च कृतं मे वपुषि वसन्त इव मधुमासेन, मधुमास इव नवपल्लवेन, नवपल्लव इव कुसुमेन, कुसुम इव मधुकरेण, मधुकर इव मदेन नवयौवनेन पदम् ।

It is this vision of beauty that Śuka sows broadcast in his descriptions of the Bāla Līlās, which the Gopī praised as triply blest—श्रवणमङ्गलं, ध्यानमङ्गलं and विश्वमङ्गलम् । The miracles are so many and so casually disposed of that you soon come to take them as a matter of course. When Pūtanā is killed it is not so much wonder or terror that the sympathetic reader feels as an onrush of affection for the child, so seemingly helpless, lying so confidingly on top of that mountainous form; and it is a feeling of kindliness not unmixed with envy that he feels for the would-be murderess sanctified by death, which in her case proves a veritable sea-change:

दह्यमानस्य देहस्य धूमश्चागुरुसौरभः ।
उत्थितः कृष्णनिर्भुक्तसपद्याहतपाप्मनः ॥

For the Gopīs and the young lads of Vraja the miracles have the attraction of the unexpected because they are part of Kṛṣṇa who is ever surprising them with new visions of loveliness. It is no accident that the Bāla Līlā portion contains almost all the entrancing pictures which have served generations of bhaktas as dhyāna ślokas:

बिभ्रद्वेणुं जठरपटयोः शृङ्गवेत्रे च कक्षे
वामे पाणौ मसृणकवलं तत्फलान्यङ्गुलीषु ।
तिष्ठन्मध्ये स्वपरिसुहृदो हासयन्नर्मभिः स्वैः
स्वर्गे लोके मिषति बुभुजे यज्ञभुग्बालकेलिः ॥
बर्हापीडं नटवरवपुः कर्णयोः कर्णिकारं
बिभ्रद्वासः कनककपिशं वैजयन्तीं च मालाम् ।
रन्ध्रान्वेणोरधरसुधया पूरयन् गोपवृन्दैः
वृन्दारण्यं स्वपदरमणं प्राविशद्गीतकीर्तिः ॥

None of these, it will be noticed, has any hint of the supernatural about it. But the poet succeeds in making you feel that the mere proximity of the Divine child was enough to send a tremor of joy through all created things. What a tremendous upsurge of affection there was in the breasts of the mothers of Vraja and of the cows when the Lord resolved to

baulk Brahmā by Himself becoming for the nonce both the calves and the children who took charge of them.

But Śrī Kṛṣṇa was not only the 'svajana' of the Gopīs; He had as many personalities as there were bhaktas, voluntary and involuntary, over whom He exercised mysterious fascination. Nārada told Yudhiṣṭhira:

गोप्यः कामाद्भयात्कंसो द्वेषाच्चैद्यादयो नृपाः ।
संबन्धाद्वृष्णयः स्नेहाद्यूयं भक्त्या वयं विभो ॥

One of the most famous ślokas in the Bhāgavata presents the Lord as He appears in the great divide of His earthly career, when he is about to enter the arena to fight the pugilists of Kamsa.

मल्लानामशनिः नृणां नरवरः स्त्रीणां स्मरो मूर्तिमान्
गोपानां स्वजनोऽसतां क्षितिभुजां शास्ता स्वपित्रोः शिशुः ।
मृत्युर्भोजपतेः विराडविदुषां तत्त्वं परं योगिनां
वृष्णीनां परदेवतेति विदितो रङ्गं गतस्साग्रजः ॥

Each got from Him what he looked for in Him. But the common bond was self-forgetful absorption, the तन्मयत्वं रसेषु of which Kālidāsa speaks. The elders of Gokula with Nanda Gopa at their head marvelled again and again at the exploits of this wonder-child, but they soon forgot them and were content to thank Destiny that had so miraculously preserved Him from peril after peril. Devakī and Vasudeva, who had been vouchsafed a vision of His *aprākṛta* form at the very start, could somehow never quite remember that their son was the Lord of the Universe. It almost looks as if Śrī Kṛṣṇa wanted to show that no mere man could, by being given a glimpse of the unveiled face of Deity, be convinced that he had indeed looked on it, or be transformed in the process. Take the case of Akrūra who rolled in ecstasy on the sands of Vraja because they bore the foot-prints of the Divine children and to whom when bathing in the Yamunā was granted the vision of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's identity with the Supreme Being. Who could believe that such a devout soul could join Sudhanva and Kṛtavarma in the conspiracy to cheat Śrī Kṛṣṇa of the Syamantaka jewel? This is so completely out of keeping with what we know of him before and after that Śrīdhara Svāmi stoutly maintains that Akrūra left Dvārakā, clandestinely perhaps, but with the knowledge and consent of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

The text would hardly seem to warrant this nobly charitable interpretation. But it is instructive to compare the account of this episode in the Bhāgavata with that in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa. The latter is much more realistic and makes out that Akrūra, though a better man than most, was not above ordinary human failings. His action in running away with the jewel is ascribed to disappointment and anger that Śrī Kṛṣṇa should have married Satyabhāmā whose hand had been promised him. But the Bhāgavata version takes scrupulous care not to dim the lustre of this devout bhakta. He is shown more as an unwilling victim to *yoga māyā*. He who had surrendered himself to the beauty of the Divine child at Gokula was confounded by the ways past understanding of the Paramātmā in Dvārakā.

The women were rather more percipient than the men. It is in their hearts that His infinite variety and charm are reflected as in a thousand mirrors. The mother-love of Yaśodā, the *mugdha-praṇaya* of the little girls who prayed to Ambikā to grant them the boon of getting Kṛṣṇa for their spouse, the wistful tenderness of the Yajña Patnīs, the self-forgetting, self-consuming passion of the Gopīs, the adoration of Rukmiṇī—it is these that flash back that brilliance of a thousand facets.

But, of all the great souls who came into contact with Śrī Kṛṣṇa none but Uddhava understood Him quite or accepted Him in His illimitable fullness. Uddhava alone had achieved the unitive consciousness; and he was content to be the footstool of the Lord. It was Uddhava He sent to the Gopīs to console them; it was Uddhava who accompanied Him to the house of Sairandhrī the siren; and in one of those unforgettable vignettes of happy domesticity we get in the last adhyāyas of the Daśama Skandha it is Uddhava who forms the third of the party when the Lord plays at dice with His own consort. No wonder that when Śrī Kṛṣṇa goes to Vaikuṇṭha He leaves Uddhava in charge of His message, saying "Uddhava is in no wise inferior to me." One is irresistibly reminded of the other great Bhāgavata Hanumān who prefers to remain on earth because there he can listen to the sweet music of the Rāmāyaṇa.

And mention of music brings us to the magic of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's flute. The Rāsa Panchādhyāyī is the heart of the Daśama Skandha as the Daśama is the heart of the Bhāgavata. Śrī Kṛṣṇa is presented there as the Rasaprada *par excellence*.

Those who surrender themselves to the imperious call of the flute find fulfilment forthwith; as did the Gopīs who could not join Him on that glorious night when all Nature voiced the summons to the sands of the Yamuna:

विकसत्कुन्दमन्दारसुरभ्यनिलषट्पदम् ।
शरच्चन्द्रांशुसन्दोहध्वस्तदोषातमःशिवम् ।
कृष्णाया हस्ततरलाचितकोमलवालुकम् ।

The *viraha* of those forcibly detained at home was so great that they shook off the mortal coil and attained Him sooner than those who joined in the dance. For these latter were afflicted with मान that ultimate egoism which makes for separation. In a famous couplet Śrī Kṛṣṇa Chaitanya points out that मान is the enemy.

तृणादपि सुनीचेन तरोरपि सहिष्णुना ।
अमानिना मानदेन कीर्तनीयः सदा हरिः ॥

And when Śrī Kṛṣṇa tells Yudhiṣṭhira that he could go ahead with the *Aśvamedha* He explicitly endorses this. "Having, by thy self-control, won Me—whom the self-willed can never hope to gain,—you will find that no one else will be able to withstand you."

Neither the devas nor the asuras, as the Bhāgavata sees them, are wholly free from the besetting sin of egoism. Vṛtra, Bali and Hiraṇyakaśipu are profoundly aware of the paramountcy of God, the transience of life, the inescapable law of Karma. And yet they go on challenging fate because they must needs obey the law of their being which is self-assertiveness. Brahmā and Indra make the same mistake, piqued it would almost seem by professional jealousy! But they have the grace to admit their mistake and make handsome amends.

The world, it has been said, is an idea in the mind of Deity. And in the Bhāgavata the cosmic vision of Śuka the seer gives us the mind of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, that world of infinite harmony, endless delight and limitless love. In his portrayal of the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa there is a highly selective imagination at work. I have referred to the manner in which he handles the Akrūra story. Not less striking in its own way is the story of how Sālva tries to bewilder Śrī Kṛṣṇa by cleaving in twain before his very eyes a magical double of Vasudeva. The episode is obviously reminiscent of the incident in the Rāmāyaṇa in which Indrajit momentarily deludes Hanumān by a similar trick. But, after recounting the

story of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's confusion Śuka explains that he gives the version of the incident as he had it from his predecessors, but he himself does not believe it, because he is convinced that the Ever-Enlightened One could never have been thus deluded. He says, again and again, "Because Śrī Rāma and Śrī Kṛṣṇa acted like men in certain circumstances, don't be so foolish as to conclude that they were mortals or that you can do with impunity what they did. They were, you may be sure, setting an example to humanity or warning it against the pitfalls. Erring man can do no better than obey their injunctions implicitly. But he who accepts the Eternal Kṛṣṇa, the Beauty and Delight that sustain the Universe, passes unscathed beyond the bounds of sorrow and sin." The Bhāgavata bodies forth the Supreme Person of the Upanishads: रसो वै सः ॥

I have dealt at some length with the Bhāgavata as a supreme example of traditional Art which is founded on the bed-rock of metaphysic. But in our preoccupation with ideas we must not forget form and language. Degas, the French painter, who also dabbled in verse, once complained to Mallarmé, the poet, that while he was full of ideas the poems would not come out. Mallarmé's reply was: "My dear fellow, poetry isn't written with ideas; it's written with words." Samskrit poets would prefer to say that word and meaning are indivisible: वागर्थाविव संपृक्तौ is the famous simile by which Kālidāsa establishes the identity of Śiva and Śakti. It is not therefore surprising that Śuka is a great artist in words and that his sense of form is infallible. In the Kuchela Upākhyāna you have that combination of intensity of vision with swiftness of narrative and economy of statement which produces the impression of inevitability; it is great art. It is true that the Bhāgavata contains large and frequent patches of aridity—conventional descriptions, abstract dissertations and, as some would complain, fanciful cosmology. But which great writer is uniformly excellent? Remember, too, that traditional art moves within the broad limits of a pre-determined orbit, and must conform to certain basic requirements.

But, within those limits, what a wealth of life is there! Śuka the nityasiddha knew the entire gamut of human emotions. The psychologist in him was not less wide awake than the moralist. Take the Jaḍa Bharata story: it is not

only great prose, it is superb drama. Could the hopes and fears of the fond parent be more subtly pictured than in the memorable soliloquies of the Royal sage who was but the other day on the threshold of liberation but is getting every moment deeper into the slough of attachment? Look at the tremendous study in contrast offered by the Vāmana-Trivikrama avatāra. How convincingly it establishes that the moral law is part of the Ṛta or natural order that sustains the cosmos. The Viśvarūpa Darśana in the Gītā is justly famous; but it seems to me that the dynamic vision of the Lord overwhelming the three worlds is not less impressive. And the sense of awe in the mind of the reader gives place to exulting adoration when, by one of those transforming touches which come so naturally to the seer of the Bhāgavata, the vision is momentarily focussed on the homely garland of *tulasi* which the Cosmic Person loves to wear.

मधुव्रतस्रग्वनमालया वृतो रराज राजन् भगवानुरुक्रमः ।

That the Lord can be lovable in his most terrible mood the Prahlāda Upākhyāna triumphantly establishes. And, talking of Prahlāda, what a marvellous insight into the child mind the Bhāgavata offers! Dhruva, Prahlāda, Nārada, the fortunate children of Vraja and, as the crest-jewel of them all, the darling of the Gopīs Himself—what a glorious testimony they offer to the humanity of the sage! He, the सर्वभूतहृदय, is as sensitive to the despairing appeal of Gajendra as to the piteous cry of Uttarā fleeing from Aśvatthāman's unrighteous wrath. And his art is so consummate that he transmits to the reader something of his own universal sympathy. His words drip honey when he speaks of the Ekānta Bhakta; but he can also sting like a whip of scorpions. The rapier-like thrust of his irony exposes the purse-proud and the power-mad; but he can gently laugh at the foibles of the frail. Above all, to the reader who surrenders himself to his subtle influence, he can communicate something of the passionless peace with which he, the आत्माराम, confronts the world. Thanks to the supreme genius of Śuka Brahmam there wells up in the heart of the devout student, as he contemplates the eternally recurrent miracle on the banks of the Yamunā, that deep delight which made the great Advaitin and Kṛṣṇa Bhakta, Madhusūdana Sarasvatī exclaim in rapture:

कालिन्दीपुलिनेषु यत्किमपि तन्नीलं तमो धावति ।

THE LATER DAYS OF BHŌJA 'THE GREAT'.

BY

VEDAM VENKATARAYA SASTRI, M.A.

The name of King Bhōja is enough to conjure with in Sanskrit Literature. He flourished during the first half of the 11th century and was the contemporary of Karṇa of Dāhaḷa, Bhīma of Aṇhilwad and three great South Indian Kings, Trailōkyamalla-Āhavamalla of the Karṇātaka, Rājādhirāja of the Cōlas and Rājarājanarēndra of the E. Cāḷukyas. But the connections of this monarch with these kings is still to be worked out. Though the northern sources are meagre, South Indian Epigraphy coupled with the literature of the North seems to throw some light on the later days of this talented ruler.

The evening of Bhōja's life was far from being peaceful. His existence and the fortunes of his realm were threatened by enemies on all sides. There are several divergent stories about the troubles and subsequent death of Bhōja. Mērutuṅga in his Prabhandha-cintāmaṇi says that Bhīma of Anhilwad being unable to attack Bhōja until the latter incurred the hostility of the Dāhaḷa King Karṇa, joined Karṇa in an attack on Bhōja and agreed to share the war spoils on equal terms. Karṇa, it is said, was assisted by one-hundred and thirty-six princes. After the conquest of Malwa, the poem continues, there was disagreement between the two allied kings as Karṇa took the entire spoils without caring for Bhīma. Thereupon the clever agent of Bhīma imprisoned Karṇa when he was asleep and extracted from the latter a golden shrine and the image of Śiva. The poem further states that King Bhōja being attacked by these two kings, lost his pride, as a snake, overcome by a charm, loses its poison and then being overtaken by a corporeal malady died. The Vadnagar praśasti of the Cāuḷukya Kumārapāla states that 'his (Bhīma's) horses, supremely skilled in accomplishing the five paces (called Dhārā) quickly gained Dhārā, the capital of the Emperor of Malwa' (E.I. Vol. I, p. 297, v. 9). The Kīrtikaumudī says that Bhīma vanquished Bhōja, king of Dhar, but spared his life. (Sarga II, vv. 16-18). Similarly the Sukṛtasankīrtana states that Bhōja was defeated by Bhīma. (Sarga II, vv. 17-20) The Kumārapālacarita of

Jayasiṁhadēva poetically states that before the greatness of Bhīma the arm of Bhōja faded away like a lotus (v. 34). Hēmacandra mentions nothing of the battle between Bhīma and Bhōja but says that Karṇa defeated Bhōja but being hard pressed by Bhīma's agent Dāmōdara, surrendered Maṇḍapikā to Bhīma. (Dvyāśraya-kāvya, Sarga IX, v. 57, p. 692).

More clear and authentic information is found in the Cāḷukyan records and the king of the Deccan seems to have given the coup-de-grace to the last scene of Bhōja. The statement of Bilhaṇa (Vikramāṅkadēvacarita, Canto I vv. 91-94) that Sōmēśvara deprived Dhārā of Bhōja (Bhōjakshamāpāla vimukta Dhārā) and swallowed it like a morsel of food (Dhārām......kavalīcakāra) seems to mean more directly that Bhōja perished in his wars with the Karṇātakas. The details of the Cāḷukyan invasion of Mālwa are given in the Hōysala records very vividly. It is stated that when the fortresses of the Mālwa king were impregnable baffling all the efforts of the Cāḷukyas, Ereyanga, the Hoysala Chief, took great pains and leading a campaign conqurered Māḷava in the very presence of his lord, the Cāḷukyan king. (E.C. V, A.K. 117). Another record states that at the orders of the Cāḷukyan Emperor, Ereyanga led an expedition to Māḷava and married the damsel of victory through Dhārā with Agni for witness, meaning thereby that he conquered Dhārā and burnt the palace. There is a pun here on the words Dhārā and Agni as a Hindu marriage is done by the bride being offerred and given away along with a watery libation and the oaths being taken at the altar of fire (E.C. V. AK. 102 A.V.) The Belur record of 1117 A.D. gives greater details about the burning of Dhārā. ' Dhārā, the well-known (city), the resort of all the valorous Māḷava kings, enlarged by Bhōja the powerful who had conquered all his enemies, she, became the first sip of water (Āpōśana) for Ereyanga in eating up the royal foes at the time of his conquest of the direction of Kubēra (the north); how about describing such a warrior. Obstructing the sight, encasing (with smoke) and making the white tusks of the elephants of the corners of the world look dark and making the entire cloudless space between the earth and the heaven look full of clouds by the smoke, Poysala, whose valour is like a big fire, set fire to the principal (or border) fortresses of Bhōja. Who is more valiant than this (Valiant—Dhīra,) who erected a column of smoke as if it were

the victory column of his emperor (Trailōkyamalla—Āhavamalla), causing the beginning of the destruction of Bhōja, full of 'rāga' (red colour due to flames and love due to his loyalty) by killing the enemies and burning them (and their property) while, on his march, the hills of the four (quarters) by their uproar and being screened by the cloud-like dust caused by his army looked as if they were covered by real thundering clouds? (The translation of Mr. Rice is incomplete and faulty. This is a fresh and true translation). The principal fortresses burnt by Ereyanga are named in another record. (E.C. V, AK. 102-A). 'The unobstructed fire of valour of Poysala ate Khaṇḍava and covered it completely, burnt Maṇḍava on the slopes of the Vindhya Mountains and took Udhapuram' (Rice's Translation is once again faulty. This is fresh one). Of these three places Maṇḍava is clearly Mandu fourteen miles from Dhār itself and it was one of the important fortresses of the Paramaras. Khaṇḍava is decidedly a place in the Malwa country as there is no allusion to the Mahābhārata story in the verse. Udhapuram is no doubt Udaipur of the Paramāras and the findspot of many of their records.

Ereyanga was not all alone in this triumph and besides him there were several others, officers and subordinates of Āhavamalla, who took part in this expedition against Bhōja. Guṇḍamayya one of the Daṇḍanāyakas of Sōmēśvara states that he was like a royal swan strolling on both the banks of the Narmadā, an evil comet to the Māḷava people, the capturer the fort of Maṇḍava and was held in honour in the city of Dhārā. (A.R. of Mysore 1939 pp. 68-69). The Kākatīya prince Bēta II states that he was a lion to the maddened elephants, the Cōḷa and Māḷava. (Khazipet Insn. Hy. Arch. Series 13-7). The Bhrahman Daṇḍanāyaka, Bācharasa, the second son of Kāḷidasa Daṇḍanātha, is praised in the Nagai record of 1058 A.D., as having subdued the Māḷava and several others. (H.A.S. 8). His brother Madhusūdana is also credited with a victory over Dhārā and is said to have expelled Bhōja from that city (Ibid). Nāgadēva the Mahāsāmantādhipati and the Mahāpracaṇḍa Daṇḍanāyaka is called in 1061 A.D. as Cōḷa Kālāntaka, Bhōja-bhujanga-ahidviṣa, Gūrjara Madaharaṇa (L.R. Vol. 25, p. 156). Jēmarasa another feudatory is described as a 'flame of doom to Bhōja' (The Hottur record of 1067 A.D. E.I. XVI, p. 86).

Besides these references Āhavamalla, the Cāḷukyan emperor credits himself with the conquest of Dhārā and burning of Maṇḍava. Western Cāḷukyan history seems to help in not only fixing the date of the fall of Bhōja but in arranging the course of events also. The last known date of Bhōja is 1047 A.D., which is found in the Tilakwada copper plates. The next ruler of Malwa is known as a certain Paramāra Jayasimha from his first record in 1055 A.D. (The Māndhāta Plates, E.I. III, p. 46). It is not known whether this Jayasimha succeeded Bhōja immediately, was the son of Bhōja or was of a collateral branch of the Paramāras. He simply states that he is a 'pādānudhyāta' of (meditator on the feet of) Bhōja. The long gap between the two dates is enough to confirm the above story and make the historian think that there was confusion and anarchy in the realm of Bhōja for some time. The events in the Deccan were as follows. In 1048 A.D. Āhavamalla was fighting with the Cōḷas (S.I.I. Vol. IV, 329). In 1049 A.D. he was staying at Vagghāpura in the Karahātanādu after his 'Pallava-digvijaya' (B.K. I-I, 83). Whether this expedition was to punish Bhōja or not it is clear that it was aimed at some rulers of Konkaṇ as we find Cāḷukyan generals fighting there. In 1047 Akkādēvi, the aunt of Sōmēś-vara I, was active around the fortress of Gokak near Belgaum. (B.K. I-I, 80). She is seen staying in Konkaṇa even three years later restoring peace in the land. She was 'restoring the corporate constitution of eight Settis and eighty house-holders which bad broken down in the stress of the war with the Cōḷas'. (B.K. I-I, 87). In the same year a little later she is found sending a certain commander, Ajjarasa, on some enemy in the neighbourhood (B.K. I-I, 86). Hence it is clear that there was trouble in Konkaṇa before 1047 A.D. and while Akkādēvi was keeping the enemy at bay Āhavamalla also came to her help after defeating the Cōḷas in 1048 A.D. That this rebellion in the Konkaṇa was due to the Cōḷa diplomacy is also clear from the above records of Akkādēvi.

Besides Āhavamalla Sōmēśvara there were some of his able generals fighting the Konkaṇigas. A record of 1053 A.D. mentions this enemy of the Cāḷukyas as the Śilāhāra chief Mummuri who was having his seat of Government at Thaṇe. The Ratta chief Kārtavīrya bears the title 'Mummuri-kon-kaṇiga-jaladhi-baḍabānalam' (The submarine fire to the Ocean Mummuri of Konkaṇa) and 'Thāṇeya-kautūhalam'

(an interesting object to Thāṇe) (L.R. 25, p. 217; E.I. XII, p. 268). The Mahāmaṇḍalalēśvara Mummuṇi Mummuri or Mamvaṇi is one of the Śilāhāra chiefs for whom we have a date in Śaka 982 (A.D. 1059-60) recording that a palace of Chittarāja was restored for his use (D.K.D. of Dr. Fleet p. 543). He appears as the second younger brother of Chittarāja of Thāṇe (D.K.D. p. 539). Besides Kārtavīrya, there was another general called Pulakēśi who attacked Mummuri. The Bharangi record of the time of Cāḷukya Vikramāditya VI, dated 1118 A.D. (E.C. VIII, Sb. 325) gives the following praise of Āhavamalla and Pulakēśi: '... marching upon Thāṇe, twisting the neck of Mummuri and putting in his place an agent under his own orders, Pulakēśi without any difficulty burnt Kānci; it being said that the Cōḷa burnt Kalyāṇa, taking a single elephant the King Āhavamalla with invincible courage slew the warlike Cōḷa.' Though the record belongs to a later date, there is no doubt that these events happened before the great battle of Koppam in which the Cōḷa king, Rājādhirāja, died in 1054 A.D.

The Cōḷa was the natural enemy of the Karṇātaka King and there were regular invasions of the dominions of the latter by the former from 1044 A.D. to 1054 A.D. There must have been very strong reasons for Sōmēśvara to punish the Konkaṇa chief in between two Cōḷa wars. The Konkaṇigas were under the influence of the Cōḷas, and Āhavamalla appears to have felt them a source of danger at his rear while fighting with the Cōḷas. Similar was the position of Bhōja and there is strong reason to believe that he was in league with the Cōḷas. The enmity of the Cāḷukyas with the Paramāras having had its beginning under Tailapa and Muñja was continuing and there are instances where the Paramāras had gone directly to the Cōḷas to get help against the Western Cālukyas. The records of the 33rd year of Rājādhirāja (1050-51) mention another of the Cōḷa wars with Āhavamalla and state that the Cōḷa king offered protection to the descendants of the Gūrjara Uppalan, slain formerly by Tailapa and restored (to them) the crown of the former seized and attached by the latter to his war-drum and thus subjugated the Rattapadi seven-and-a-half-lakh country (E.C. IX, Dv. 76). Besides this we find Āhavamalla almost simultaneously engaged in fighting with the Cōḷa on the south and Bhōja and Konkaṇa on the north

Turning to the events of the period there is good reason to state that Āhavamalla went to Malwa from Karahad in 1049 A.D. leaving Polakēśi and others to deal with the Konkaṇa, for the Bharangi record states that Polakēśi after punishing Mummuri set fire to Kānci after which the Cōḷas (in retaliation) burnt Kalyāṇa and Āhavamalla hearing of it hastily reached home. A record from Nagai dated 1058 A.D. vividly describes that Āhavamalla hastened home from Māṇḍu and gives the order of the events. (Hy. Arch. Series No. 8 B). "The King Trailōkyamalla, having on that side (that is the North Indian) entered and burnt Dhārā with determination, having on this (side, the southern) penetrated and set on fire (the city of) Kānci by the strength of arm which had already (or just before 'Munnam') captured Maṇḍava and killed the Cōḷā in anger, brought his (Cōḷa's) fresh decapitated head. Having raided on and burnt the city of Ujjain noted for (its) ramparts (alurkke) (he) there bore the silver ball with pride, by the strength of his arm" (V. 17).

The order of the events is this: (*a*) burning of Dhārā and capture of Maṇḍava, (*b*) burning of Kānci and (*c*) the killing of the Cōḷa. The order of events according to Bharangi record is as follows: (*a*) punishment of Mummuri, (*b*) the burning of Kānci by Polakēśi, (*c*) the burning of Kalyāṇa by the Cōḷas, (*d*) the death of the Cōḷa and (*e*) another expedition to Dhārā. The burning of Dhārā and the punishment of Mummuri appear to have been simultaneous events. Kānci was next burnt by Polakēśi and the Cōḷas gave a similar treatment to Kalyāṇa in retaliation. Then Āhavamalla having heard of it returned home and met the Cōḷa in battle.

It is now clear that the exploits of Ereyanga in Malwa were identical with those of Āhavamalla, that is that he distinguished himself during the expedition of the latter. The death of Cōḷa is no doubt the death of Rājādhirāja in the field at Koppam in 1053-54 A.D. The earlier event, the burning of Kalyāṇa is first mentioned in the Cōḷa record of the 33rd year of Rājādhirāja A.D. 1051 (S.I.I. VII, 1046). Corroborating the statement that Āhavamalla returned home after he heard of the sack of Kalyāṇa we find a record showing him staying at Kalyāṇa itself in December 1052 A.D. (S.I.I. IX-I, 111). Hence if Kalyāṇa was burnt a little before 1051 A.D., that of Kāṇci decidedly preceeded it, most probably when the Cōḷas

were leading a campaign against the Cāḷukyas that same year. It is now quite clear that Āhavamalla's attack on Bhōja and that of Polakēśi on Mummuri should have taken place about 1050 A.D. as Āhavamalla was in Karahāta in 1049 A.D. and the Cōlas received at Etagiri and Pundur in 1051 A.D. an embassy from the descendants of Uppala Gūrjara to help them against the Western Cāḷukyas.

The following events also prove that Bhōja was dead by 1050 A.D. It cannot be said definitely that it was Bhōja who sent an embassy to the Cōḷas as he is the nephew of Muñja and not his son. The Cōḷa record of 1051 mentions the refugees as the descendants in the plural and it is likely that Bhōja having died some time before there were rival claimants to the throne of Malwa and some of them approched the Cōḷas. The Nagai record quoted above mentions an expedition to Dhārā after the death of the Cōḷa on the field. This should have happened definitely after the Koppam battle. To confirm this there were the following events. In the year 1055 A.D. the Paramāra king Jayasimha is found as the ruler of Malwa in Dhārā (E. I. III, p. 46). The date of his accession is not known but it is likely that he ascended the throne sometime earlier. Though it is not known whether he was the son of Bhōja or a descendant of Uppalan there is a later tradition preserved in the Ain-i-Akbari as follows: "Muñja gave thanks to God, welcomed Bhōja ... and appointed him as his successor. When his son Jayachand's reign ended none of the Ponwar cast was found worthy to succeed". Dr. Ganguli believes that Jayachand is Jayasimha. If this is to be accepted he was either the descendant of Uppalan or his rival to the Malwa throne. The rule of Jayasimha lasted only till the end of 1059 A.D. (Panhera Insn. A.S.I. 1916-17, p. 19). Almost the same year we find Udayāditya Paramāra ruling over Malwa (D.H.N.I. II, pp. 875). Udayāditya, in the Nagpur-prasasti (E.I. II, pp. 192-195, v. 32) is said to have taken his ancestral throne by driving away the combined forces of the Karnātas and the Cēdis. It follows: 'When he (Bhōja) had become Indra's companion and when the realm was overrun by floods in which its sovereign was submerged, his relation, Udayāditya, became king. Uplifting the earth, which was troubled by kings and taken possession of by Karṇa, who, joined by the Karṇātas, was like the mighty ocean, he acted like the holy Boar.' If Udayāditya was a

'relation' of Bhōja and not his son and if he defeated Jayasimha, which is most probable as he was the previous ruler, and took the kingdom from him after ousting the combined forces of the Karnātas and Karṇa, it follows that Udayāditya was most probably the 'descendant of Uppalan' of the Cōḷa records and Jayasimha was a friend of the Karnātas and the Cēdis. To confirm this as it were the Vikramānkadēva-caritam states that Vikramāditya restored to Malwa a prince of the royal family who took shelter under him (Sarga III, v. 67).

Putting the above facts together: 1. The probable death of Bhōja in about 1050 A.D., 2. The embassy received by Rājādhirāja at Etagiri from the 'descendants' of Uppalan, before 1054 A.D., 3. The Cāḷukyan invasion of Malwa soon after the Koppam battle or a little later, 4. The accession of Jayasimha sometime before 1055 A.D. to Malwa, and finally 5. his overthrow by Udayāditya after defeating the Karnātas and the Cēdis before 1059 A.D. - it is quite plain that Bhōja died in the Cāḷukyan war in 1050 A.D. and there were rival claimants to the Malwa throne. One of them approached the Cōḷas and the other, the Cālukyas. Most probably Jayasimha was installed by the Cāḷukyas and the honour of superintending the work was given to Vikramāditya in 1050 A.D. itself. The Cōḷas encouraged their candidate by giving constant trouble to the Cāḷukyas thereby disabling them from helping their candidate in Malwa. The Cāḷukyas however went to the succour of Jayasimha in about 1059 A.D., after defeating the Cōḷas at Koppam in 1054, but unfortunately were defeated along with their ally, Karṇa of Cēdi.

The Cēdi King Karṇa seems to have broken with the Cāḷukyas soon after for Bilhaṇa states in his usual poetic way (sarga I, v. 102) that Āhavamalla made the damsel of the fortune of Dāhalā (of the Cēdis) bereft of 'Karṇa' (also ear) for picking up a quarrel with him and on account of that (loss of Karṇa) she (Dāhaḷā) is still not able to wear the ear-ornaments of fame which are white like camphor. It is not known how this quarrel arose but the Nagpur-praśasti seems to indicate that Karṇa was the chief man in fighting with Udayāditya and the Karnāta Āhavamalla joined him. ('Miḷat Karnāta Karṇa prabhum'-note the singular 'prabhum'). It is likely that the Karṇāta allies of Karṇa failed his expecta-

tion in defending Jayasimha in 1059-60 though they joined him against Udayāditya and hence the quarrel. As this expedition is attributed to Āhavamalla and not Vikramāditya the date falls in about 1059 as the latter's triumphal march was undertaken towards the end of Āhavamalla's reign.

There seems to be some substratum of truth in the statements of Mērutunga though he does not mention the part played by the Karnātakas and gives a somewhat confused account. His account may be accepted with some alterations in the light of epigraphy as follows. As he says Bhīma was unable to defeat Bhōja till 1047 without help and the defeat of the Gūrjara by Sūrāditya the general of Bhōja might well corroborate the above statement as the rulers of Anhilwad were also the lords of Gujerat. (Tilakwada plates.) Then there was an alliance between Bhīma and Karṇa, and Sōmēśvara joined them in about 1049. The princes who attacked Bhōja in the company of Karṇa could have been none else than the feudatories of Bhīma, Karṇa and Sōmēśvara of Karnātaka. Most probably the Karnātaka feudatories were large in number as we find the Hoysalas and the Kākatīyas of princely rank among the allies. That Bhōja was free and defeated some of his enemies before this huge coalition of his enemies attacked him is also clear from the Hoysala record which states that 'Dhārā, the well-known (city) the resort of all the valorous Māḷava Kings, enlarged by Bhoja the powerful who had conquered all his enemies, she became the first sip of water for Ereyanga in eating up the royal foes at the time of his conquest of the direction of Kubēra (the north)'. There is no doubt that Sōmēśvara was a member of the opposition in this connection as the record of Udayāditya testifies to it.

The story of the quarrel between the allies also seems to be true. In the spoils of Dhārā Āhavamalla also had his share for he is said to have taken 'a ball of silver at Dhar' which is otherwise inexplicable. ("Belliya-gundu gondan adatam" Nagai record). It is not known whether Bhīma and Karṇa disagreed soon after Bhōja's death but Karṇa and Sōmeśvara were on good terms until Udayāditya defeated them in 1059, and Sōmēśvara and Bhīma fell out sometime before 1053, more probably after 1050 as we find Sōmēśvara II given the title 'Bhīma-kari-madanivāraṇam' in a record dated 1053 A.D,

(L.R. 25, p. 135). There is a possibility of this term 'Bhīmakari' being interpreted as 'a fierce elephant' and hence a more authentic and unambiguous evidence is required. A record of A.D. 1057 (S.I.I. IX-I, 118) after enumerating the conquests of Āhavamalla over Magadha, Gauḷa, Lāḷa, Anga, Vanga, Vangāla, Varāḷa, and Māḷava states that his son Gangapermādi (Vikramāditya) vanquished the Cōḷa, Gauḷa, Barbara, Āndhra, Māḷava and the Gūrjara. Nāgadēva, the brahman general is called the Gūrjara Madaharaṇa in 1061 A.D. (L.R. 25, p. 156). It is clear that Sōmēśvara fell out with Bhima of Anhilwad earlier than with Karṇa of Dāhaḷā and hence it is quite likely that there was some quarrel between Bhīma and Karṇa first and after Bhīma's exit from the coalition the other two fell out after 1059.

It is also possible that Bhōja was not killed in action but being overwhelmed by numbers and fighting a hard battle was overtaken by some malady and thus died full of years after a glorious career of more than half a century. Sōmēśvara whose records repeatedly state that he took the head of the Cōḷa nowhere states so clearly that he killed Bhōja. All the references are ambiguous poetic expressions and hence it is likely that this great hero was, after all, not conquered on the field.

PUṆYAKṢETRA

BY

DR. B. CH. CHHABRA, OOTACAMUND.

The compound word *puṇya-kṣetra* ordinarily denotes 'a holy place' or 'a sacred spot'. Occasionally it is used as a synonym of *tīrtha*, meaning 'a place of pilgrimage'. In the Buddhist literature, on the other hand, it has quite a different significance. And it is this that we propose to consider in the present note.

There it is used mostly in a figurative sense. And as such, it occurs not in connection with a particular place or region, but is applied as an epithet to a *bhikṣu-saṅgha*, or to an individual *bhikṣu*, or to the Buddha himself. In Pāli, the contracted form of the term is *puñña-khetta*. In the Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary it has been explained as follows: "field of merit, epithet of the Sangha or any holy personalities, doing good (lit. planting seeds of merit) to whom is a source of future compensation to the benefactor." A more lucid explanation has, however, been given by the renowned commentator Buddhaghoṣa in his *Visuddhimagga*, which we shall presently quote.

Let us first examine some of the instances where the term *puṇya-kṣetra* or *puñña-khetta* has been employed. In the famous Mahāyāna work, *Divyāvadāna*, we find it applied to Ratnaśikhin Buddha: *yasya vijite īdṛiśaṁ dvipādakaṁ puṇya-kṣetram utpannam.........puṇyamaheśākhyas tvaṁ yasya vijite dvipādakaṁ puṇyakṣetraṁ Ratnaśikhī samyaksambuddhaḥ.*[1] Mark the adjunct *dvipādakam* 'two-legged', 'two-footed', or say 'human'. The author seems thereby to be calling attention to the metaphorical use of the term *puṇyakṣetram*. It is found again in the same work in the following *Āryā*, descriptive of the Sthavira Mahākāśyapa:

Puṇyakṣetram udāraṁ dīnānugrāhako nirāyāsaḥ |
Sarvajñacīvaradharaḥ śāsanasaṁdhārako matimān ||[2]

---

1. The *Divyāvadāna*, edited by E.B. Cowell and R.A. Neil, Cambridge, 1886, p. 63.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 395. The text given by the editors has *dīnātura-grāhako* instead of *dīnānugrāhako*. The latter, I presume, must be the correct reading, not only because *anugrāhaka* is better suited to the sense than *grāhaka*, but also because the metre is thereby set aright.

It may in passing be observed that this Mahākāśyapa was a chief disciple of Gautama Buddha who showed special favours to him. At the time of *nirvāṇa*, the Master bestowed his own *saṅghāṭī* on Mahākāśyapa who wore it ever afterwards. This is what is referred to in the verse quoted above: *Sarvajña-cīvaradharaḥ* 'he who wore the garment of Sarvajña'. This latter, it may be remembered, is a well-known name of the Buddha.[3]

The pre-eminence of Mahākāśyapa is further testified to by the existence of a stone statue of his, carved in the round, now sorely damaged, which was discovered at Silāo, near Rājagṛha which was Mahākāśyapa's home. The pedestal of the statue contains a Sanskrit inscription in which the *saṅghāṭī*-bestowal incident is clearly narrated. In my edition of this inscription I had occasion to give a fuller account of the saint's life.[4]

Reverting to the main topic, it is found that the term in question is more frequently used in Pāli. The following is said of the Buddha himself:

Buddho bhavaṁ arahati pūraḷāsaṁ
puññakkhettam anuttaraṁ
āyāgo sabbalokassa, bhoto dinnaṁ mahapphalan[5]

Speaking of the *bhikkhusaṁgha*, the Buddha says: *Tathārūpo ayaṁ, bhikkhave, bhikkhusaṁgho,......āhuneyyo pāhuneyyo dakkhiṇeyyo añjalikaraṇīyo*: *Anuttaraṁ puññakkhettaṁ lokassāti.*[6]

The *bhikkhusaṁgha* is more often referred to under the name of *sāvakasaṁgha*. The description is always the same as given above.[7] An individual *bhikṣu* is described in identical terms.[8] It may be noticed that *anuttara* is an

3. *Amara*, giving the synonyms of the Buddha, starts with the name Sarvajña itself: *Sarvajñaḥ Sugato Buddho*, etc.

4. *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XXV, pp. 327-34.

5. The *Suttanipāta* (Pali Text Society), London, 1913, p. 86.

6. The *Majjhimanikāya* (PTS), Vol. III, London, 1889, p. 80.

7. See, for instance, the *Saṁyuttanikāya* (PTS). Pt. V, London, 1898, pp. 343, 363, 382; the *Dīghanikāya* (PTS), Vol. III, London, 1911, pp. 5, 227.

8. The *Majjhimanikāya*, Vol. I, London, 1888, p. 446; the *Aṅguttaranikāya*, (PTS), Pt. I, London. 1885, p. 244; Pt. II, London, 1888, p. 113. For additional references, see the dictionary.

invariable adjunct in these cases. It has been rendered as 'unsurpassed' in the Pali dictionary. This, as we shall presently see, has been replaced by *parama* in a Sanskrit inscription. In the description of a *bhikṣu,* called Kappitaka, we have, however, simply *puññassak khettaṁ araṇavihārī.*[9]

Let us now have the scholastic commentary on the expression under discussion. It runs as follows:

Anuttaraṁ puññakkhettaṁ lokassā ti sabbalokassa asadisaṁ puññavirūhanaṭṭhānaṁ. Yathā hi rañño vā amaccassa vā sālīnaṁ vā yavānaṁ vā virūhanaṭṭhānaṁ rañño sālikhettaṁ [rañño] yavakhettan ti vuccati, evaṁ sangho sabbalokassa puññānaṁ virūhanaṭṭhānaṁ, sanghaṁ nissāya hi lokassa nānappakārahitasukhasaṁvattanikāni puññāni virūhanti; tasmā sangho *anuttaraṁ puññakkhettaṁ lokassā* ti.[10] Which means: It is to the whole world an extraordinary field for raising a crop of merits. As a king or a minister has a field for growing paddy or barley and it is called the king's paddy-field or [the minister's] barley-field, so also is the *saṅgha* called the whole world's merit-field, because it is by having recourse to the *saṅgha* that people cultivate virtues that fructify in various benefits and happiness to the growers.

Buddhaghoṣa has explained the term as applied to the *saṅgha,* but it holds good also in its application to the Buddha or an *arhat* of his order. It may, however, be pointed out that most frequently it is the *saṅgha,* the Buddhist Monkish Order, that is so praised. In the Sanskrit inscription alluded to above we have again to do with an *Āryasaṅgha.*

The inscription occurs on a cross-bar in the massive stone railing that encircles the great *stūpa* at Sāñchī. It has been edited by Dr. J. F. Fleet.[11] Portions of the inscription have disappeared owing to the peeling off of the stone. Unfortunately the part with which we are concerned has also been damaged, though what remains of it is sufficient to allow the restoration. Fleet, however, has missed the expression. In the text given by him, we have *parama-puṇya-kṛi......tāya,* which qualified *āryya-saṅghāya.*[12] Three

9. The *Petavatthu* (PTS), London, 1889, p. 49. v. 33.

10. The *Visuddhimagga* of Buddhaghosa (PTS), London 1920, p. 220.

11. *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum,* Vol. III (Gupta Inscriptions), pp. 29-34, Plate III-B.

12. *Ibid.,* p. 31.

letters are missing after what he reads as *kṛi*. Mr. N. G. Majumdar, who has re-edited the inscription in *The Monuments of Sāñchī* (Vol. I, pp. 388-9), followed Fleet in reading the text. On comparing the illustrations accompanying the essays of both these scholars, one may find that the syllable read by them as *kṛi* is in reality *kṣe*. This has been recognised by Dr. D. C. Sircar who has included the text of the inscription in his *Select Inscriptions* (Vol. I, pp, 273-4). He has restored the text here as *parama-puṇya-kśe*[*tra*]-[*ga*] *tāya*.. His conjecture as to *gatāya* indicates that he was unaware of the literary references cited above. Taking those into consideration, and seeing the lacunae to be filled, I would suggest to read *bhūtāya* where Sircar has conjectured *gatāya*. We shall thus have a parallel instance, in epigraphy, of the use of the term so well known in the Buddhist literature, both Pāli and Sanskrit. The incriptional *parama-pūṇya-kṣetra-bhūtāya* would be equivalent to the literary *anuttarāya puṇyakṣetrāya* (Pāli: *anuttarassa puññakkhettassa*).

KRṢṆA III AND THE CEDIS.

BY

PROF. K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI.

Among the achievements of Kṛṣṇa III as Yuvarāja under his father Amoghavarṣa III is usually included an expedition into Northern India in which he inflicted a defeat on the Cēdis. These achievements are detailed for the first time in verses 20 to 25 of the Deoli plates of Kṛṣṇa III—A.D. 940. The Karhād plates of the same ruler issued 18 years later repeat the story in the same words as the earlier grant but introduce one new verse after No. 20 of the Deoli plates. It is upon that verse that the theory of Kṛṣṇa's invasion of the Cēdi kingdom is primarily based. That verse reads:

Rāma-hata-Sahasra-bhujo bhujadvayākalita-samada-rāmeṇa I
Jananī-patnī-gururapi Yena Saharārjuno vijitaḥ II

This verse was translated by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar as follows:[1] 'He conquered Sahasrārjuna though he was an elderly relative of his mother and his wife, (Sahasrārjuna) whose thousand arms were cut off by Rāma (*i.e.* Paraśurāma) who, maddened as he was, was in his turn (*only verbally*) put down by him (*viz.*, Kṛṣṇa Rāja) by means of his two hands, he having held intoxicated young women (*rāmā*) with his two hands." He also added a note pointing it out that Bhujadvayākalita etc. is to be interpreted in two ways.

In the introduction to his edition of the Karhād plates, Sir Bhandarkar made the following remarks on the relation between the Deoli and Karhād plates over this section of the inscription. "The account in the Deoli plates ends with the coronation of Krishna III and all that he is therein represented to have done he did while he was a *Kumāra*, or Crown prince, and *Janakājñā-vaśa* i. e. acting under his father's orders, or subordinate to him. In the present grant there is one verse about him in this part, in which he is represented to have conquered Sahasrārjuna, who was an elderly relative of his mother and his wife (v. 25). Sahasrārjuna is the mythical hero to whom the Kalacuri rulers of Cedi traced their descent

1. EI. IV. p. 288.

and who in the story in the Mahābhārata is represented to have killed Jamadagni, the father of Paraśurāma and in revenge to have had his thousand arms cut off by the latter. Very likely the rulers of Cedi generally, or some of them at least particularly were called by the name of Saharārjuna after their mythical ancestor, and the name Arjuna does occur in the list of princes belonging to that family. The Sahasrārjuna therefore, who conquered by our Krishna must have been a ruler of Cedi or must have belonged to that family, and it is also likely that he was a relative of his mother and his wife. For Amoghavarṣa, the father of Krishna, is in the Kurda plates represented to have married Kandakadevi, the daughter of Yuvarāja, who must have been the same as the fourth prince in the list given by Prof. Kielhorn; who the particular prince conquered by Krishna III was, it is difficult to say".

These statements are followed by an inconclusive discussion of names given in inscriptions and their relation to Kielhorn's list which is now rather antiquated and need not concern us here.

This view of a conquest of Cedi by Kṛṣṇa III as Yuvarāja so tentatively put forward by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar has held the field. Thus Prof. Altekar writes[1] "Krishṇa then marched north-wards and defeated the Cedis though his mother and wife had been born in that family". So far Altekar only summarises Bhandarkar's suggestions, but he proceeds "The forts of Kālañjara and Citrakūṭa situated in the very heart of the Candela country were occupied by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa army, and the Gurjarapratīhāra emperor lost hope of capturing them". This statement appears to be based on verse 30 of the Karhad plates (25 of Deoli) which in view of the use made of it by Altekar must be reproduced here. It reads :

Yasya paruṣeksitā-khila-dakṣiṇa-dig-durga-vijayam ākarṇya I
Galitā Gurjara-hṛdayāt-Kālanjara-Citrakūṭāśā.II

This verse states distinctly (1) that Kṛṣṇa captured many fortresses even by his fierce look i.e. very easily in the south (2) the Gurjara ruler heard of these victories and (3) consequently lost all hope of Kālañjara and Citrakūṭa *i.e.* of capturing them for himself. It would be clear that not only

1. *Rāṣṭrakūṭas* p. 113 See also H. C. Ray *Dynastic History of Northern India*, pp. 589-90; 760-2.

did no Rāṣṭrakūṭa army occupy the forts Kālanjara and Citrakūṭa but their victories in the South acted as a bulwark protecting these forts from falling into the hands of the Gurjara ruler who was evidently entertaining ambitions against them. Yet Prof. Altekar says in a note "It is not possible to argue that Krishna assisted his Cedi relations in holding these places against the Candela; for the Deoli plates issued in May 940 A. D. soon after the capture of Kālanjara, state that Krishna III had conquered the elders of his wife and mother. This shows that Krishna was not co-operating but fighting with the Cedis." This is a very strange note. The Deoli plates say nothing about Kṛṣṇa's conquest of the Cedis, for as we have seen the verse occurs not in the Deoli but in the Karhād plates, and there is no warrant for assuming the capture of Kālanjara by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa army. The general probabilities are all against our assuming a Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion of Cedi in this period. The Cedis and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were bound by ties of close political and dynastic alliances. But Amoghavarṣa and Kṛṣṇa had spent some time in the Cedi court when the vicious reign of Govinda IV made it impossible for them to stay within the Rāṣṭrakūṭa country, and it was at Tripurī, the Cedi capital, that Amoghavarṣa gave the hand of his daughter Revakanimmaḍi, the elder sister of Kṛṣṇa III in marriage to Ganga Būtuga II (spurious Sudi plates) and for the best part of the reign of Amoghavarṣa, Kṛṣṇa was engaged in fighting in the south on behalf of his brother-in-law Būtuga II helping him to overthrow Rācamalla and seat himself firmly on the Ganga throne; and the verse we have last cited above means that the fame of these southern wars of Kṛṣṇa reached northern India and served to some extent to strengthen the political position of the Cedi rulers and other friends of Kṛṣṇa as against the enemies by whom they were surrounded, in particulars, the Gurjara Pratihāras. It seems extremely improable that Kṛṣṇa led an expedition against Cedi or had any motive for doing so.

Prof. Altekar cites the Jura *praśasti* as evidence in support of the supposed invasion of the Cedi kingdom; Dr. H. C. Ray has done likewise in his Dynastic History of Northern India;[1] but that *praśasti* was engraved several years later, after Kṛṣṇa's wars with Cola Parāntaka I and belongs

1. I. pp. 589-90, II pp. 760-2.

to a much later stage of Kṛṣṇa's career and has nothing to do with his achievements as *Yuvarāja.*

In fact the extra verse in Karhāḍ plates is a mere fancy of the poet, a play upon words and of no historical significance whatsoever. Bhandarkar did of course recognise as we have seen the *double entendre* in the verse, but he was not sure that there was no history behind it and offered some tentative guesses. But with our fuller knowledge of Cedi history and the Cedi-Rāṣṭrakūṭa relations, we should have no hesitation in treating the interpolated verse of the Karhād plates as a mere embellishment. The word '*vijitaḥ*' in that verse should not be understood as indicating a conquest in the physical sense, but should be translated into 'excelled' or 'left behind'. The verse says that Kṛṣṇa was superior to Arjuna of the thousand arms, for the thousand arms of Arjuna were cut off by Rāma (Paraśurāma) whereas with only two arms Kṛṣṇa held within them the maddened Rāmā (rāmās lustful damsels). So Arjuna of the thousand arms though the ancestor (*guru*) of Kṛṣṇa's wife and mother was easily excelled by Kṛṣṇa. There is no history here, but only mythology and word play. It may be observed finally that a verse in the Tiruvālangāḍu plates which contains a similar word play on the names Rājarāja and Bhīma based on mythical associations intrigued scholars for a long time by its apparent reference to historical events.

A word finally about Kālañjara. The famous fortress was captured by Yaśovarman, the founder of Candela power about this time.[1] He might have done so with the aid of Cedis and his success was a blow to the Gurjaras. Any hopes that the Gurjaras might have entertained of recovering the fortress must have been blasted by the resounding success of Kṛṣṇa, the ally of the Cedis, and of the Candelas. Kṛṣṇa might himself have aided Yaśovarman in the enterprise during the period of his stay at Tripurī in the reign of Govinda IV.

1. Ray: DHNI. p. 674.

ALLAHABAD PILLAR INSCRIPTION VERSES 3 & 8

BY

DR. V. RAGHAVAN

Recently, in the course of his fresh study of the texts of the Gupta Inscriptions for the purpose of their Hindi translation, Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra referred some of the verses in these inscriptions to me for scrutinising them more intensely from the literary point of view and for bringing out, thereby, the full implications of the figures in them.[1] Two of these are verses 3 and 8 of the well-known Allahabad Pillar Inscription composed by Hariṣeṇa. Verse 3 reads thus according to Fleet:

यस्य प्रज्ञानुषङ्गोचितसुखमनसः शास्त्रतत्त्वार्थभर्तुः
- - स्तब्धो . - - . नि . . . . - · नोच्छ् - . - - ।
सत्काव्यश्रीविरोधान् बुधगुणितगुणाज्ञाहतानेव कृत्वा
विद्वल्लोके वि - - स्फुटबहुकविताकीर्तिराज्यं भुनक्ति ॥

And the following is Fleet's translation of the verse:

"Whose happy mind was accustomed to associate with learned people;—who was the supporter of the real truth of the scriptures;......................firmly fixed....................;—who, having overwhelmed, with the (*force of the*) commands of the collective merits of (*his*) learned men, those things which obstruct the beauty of excellent poetry, (*still*) enjoys, in the world of the wise, the sovereignty of the fame (*produced*) by much poetry,........and clear meaning;—"

Fleet, Gupta Inscriptions, pp. 6, 11.

The meaning of the verse is not brought out clearly or correctly, the figure in it having been entirely missed. The subject is not the king himself but his Poesy,—Spuṭa-bahu-kavitā which is to be separated from kīrti-rājyam. "Spuṭa-bahu-kavitā kirti-rājyam bhunakti" is the vākya. Similarly, in line 3, the reading 'sat-kāvya-śrī- virodhān' is to be corrected into 'sat-kāvya-śrīḥ virodhān'. The verse is devoted specially to praise the king's learning and literary attainments and while the former part qualifies the king in the genetive case,—

[1] For a fruitful re-examination of this kind by Dr. Chhabra himself, see Indian Culture, XIV. 4, pp. 141-150, where he discusses the oft-quoted verse 4 of the Allahabad Pillar Inscription.

'yasya',—the latter goes with the king's well-known and prolific Poesy,—'sphuṭa-bahu-kavitā'—in the nominative. This Poesy is described here in the imagery of a king. Line 2 is beyond restoration and lines 1, 3 and 4 are to be interpreted thus:

Line 1: 'prajñā-anuṣaṅga-ucita-sukha-manasaḥ—While the minds of other kings would find delight in addiction to vyasanas like strī, madya, mṛgayā, Samudragupta found his mind's delight in intellectual preoccupation, prajñā-anuṣaṅga. Prajñā is the lady with whom he delighted.

'Śāstra-tattva-artha-bhartuḥ'—While other kings prided on their being masters of soldiers, this king protected the truths of śāstras; the śāstras were his army. Compare Kālidāsa, Raghuvaṁśa I. 19 - सेनापरिच्छदस्तस्य द्वयमेवार्थसाधनम् । शास्त्रेष्वकुण्ठिता बुद्धिः—॥

Both these viśeṣaṇas go with 'yasya' referring to Samudragupta.

Line 3: The ideas in this line go with the subject, viz., the poesy of the king,—sphuṭa-bahu-kavitā, itself described as a king. 'Sat-kāvya-śrīḥ'—the treasury or wealth of this king of poesy consisted of excellent poetical works.

'Virodhān budha-guṇita-guṇa-ājñā-hatān eva kṛtvā'—A king has enemies (*virodha*) to be overcome and similarly, the king of poesy has to overcome the *virodhas*, viz., literary flaws, kāvyadoṣas.[2] While the king's enemies would be killed (*hata*) by the command of the king (*ājñā*) in the form of the six *guṇas* of polity (*ṣāḍguṇya*) advocated by his wise counsellors (*budhas*), the literary flaws would be removed by the king of poesy by the observance of the rules (*ājñā*) for the employment of literary excellences (*guṇas* of kāvya, śleṣa, prasāda, etc.,) which have been enumerated by the learned critics (*budha-guṇita*).

Line 4: "Vidval-loke"—The world in which the king of poesy had sway is the world of scholars. 'vi......' that follows is evidently '*vi-śāle*'—'in the wide world of scholars'.

'Kīrti-rājyam bhunakti'—The exact nature and substance of the rule enjoyed by this king of poesy was 'fame'. '*kīrti-rājya*'—'the kingdom of fame'.

---

[2] Virodha in the sense of Doṣa in Kāvya is a common expression in Alaṁkāra works; see especially Daṇḍin, Kāvyādarśa III. 179, विरोधस्सकलोऽप्येष etc.

I may now offer the following translation:—"Of him whose mind found its proper delight in giving itself up to the lady of Intellect and who was the master of (the soldiers called) the truths of śāstras, the celebrated and prolific Poesy (of that king), having excellent literary productions as its treasury, having removed literary flaws by (following) the rules of the literary excellences enumerated by the learned (critics) (having destroyed all opposition by the command of the six guṇas of statecraft advocated by the wise counsellors), enjoys the kingdom of fame in the 'wide' world of scholars."

In verse 8 of the same inscription 'Dharmaprācīra etc.', Dr. Chhabra himself has made two excellent corrections, '*bandhāh*' (plural) in 'dharma-prācīra-*bandhaḥ*' at the opening of the verse and '*guṇa iti* viduṣām' in '*guṇa-mati*-viduṣām' in the last line.[3] Fleet's translation of the verse runs thus:

(*Of whom it used to be said*),—"the building of the pale of religion; fame as white as the rays of the Moon, (*and*) spreading far and wide; wisdom that pierced the essential nature of things;......................calmness.................; the path of sacred hymns, that is worthy to be studied; and even poetry, which gives free vent to the power of the mind of poets; (*all these are his*), (*in short*) what (*virtue*) is there that does not belong to him, who alone is a worthy subject of contemplation for those who can recognise merit and intellect?;"—

Here again the translation does not convey the meaning correctly. The whole first line gives only one quality, (*guṇa*), of the king, *viz.*, his fame (*kīrtayaḥ*), which is far spread (*sapratānāḥ*), and pure like the rays of the moon (*śaśi-kara-śucayaḥ*). The poet describes this fame in the imagery of creepers which too have far-reaching tendrils, sapratānāh.[4] The speciality of Samudragupta's fame is that it is pure (*śucī*), because he was a *Dharmavijayī* and the display of his prowess did not exceed the bounds of Dharma; thus the creepers of his fame did not have a wild growth, but kept themselves well within the fence of Dharma (dharma-prācīra-

---

3. See his above mentioned article in Indian Culture.
4. See Raghuvamsa II. 8. Amarakośa. II. 4. 9.

bandhāḥ)[1]. Compare Kālidāsa, Raghuvaṃśa, I. 25: अप्यर्थकामौ तस्यास्तां धर्म एव मनीषिनः ।

The king's scholarship was such that it pierced the truth of things and śāstras (vaiduṣyam tattvabhedi). The furthe portion of the line is damaged.

'adheyaḥ sūkta-mārgaḥ'—Sūkta here is not sacred hymns (vedas); it is subhāṣita, the excellent utterences of poets. The king was engrossed in the study of belles lettres. And himself an eminent man of letters, he produced literature that threw into shade the best gifts of other poets (*kavi-mati-vibhava-utsāraṇam-cāpi kāvyam*).

The learned ponder in wonder over this one man in whom there is not one endowment which is not present (*ko nu syād yo'sya na syād guṇa iti viduṣām dhyāna-pātram ya eva*).

I may offer the following translation now: " 'Wide spread fame, pure as the rays of the moon and having the fence of Dharma, piercing scholarship that comprehends the truth (of things and śāstras); ....study of belles lettres; and poesy which throws into shade the genius of (other) poets;—what excellence is there which is not in this king'; he who is the one person who is (thus) contemplated upon by the learned."

1. Amara II. 2·3: the NS. Press edn. with Bhānuji's gloss reads Prācīna, but the Śabdakalpadruma reads Prācīra.

BOOK REVIEW

The Bhagavad Gītā, with an Introductory Essay, Sanskrit Text, English Translation and Notes, by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London. 10 S. 6d net. Indian edn. 7 S. 6d net.

It is mentioned in the colophon at the end of every chapter of the Gītā that it is a Yoga Śāstra. Hence it is not a Dharma Śāstra. Further, the colophon states that it is an Upaniṣad and a Brahma Vidyā. These three phrases express succinctly the true nature of the contents and teaching of the Gītā. As such, it has come to occupy an equal place with the Brahma Sūtras and the Daśa Upaniṣads as an authority on Indian philosophy and religion, the three being known as the Prasthāna Traya. At the same time it is a popular poem and an every man's scripture. It is the combination of all these characteristics that has given to the Gītā a world-wide appeal. At the present day, it has gone even beyond the proportions of a Hindu scripture and attained the dimensions of a world scripture influencing the minds of the intelligentsia of every nation. Hence in the West, the Gītā has been translated into many European languages and there are many editions of it with introduction and notes, the latest being those of Dr. Rudolf Otto, Hill, Swami Prabhavananda and Christopher Isherwood with Introduction of Aldous Huxley, and Professor Edgerton. Dr. Radhakrishnan is an eminent philosopher of world-wide reputation and a great interpreter of Hindu religious life and thought to the modern mind. His book will therefore be welcomed by the Gītā-reading public as a valuable contribution to Gītā literature. He has written a very thought-provoking introduction and has added trenchant and suggestive commentaries on every verse of the Gītā. The text is printed in the Roman alphabet with a view to its being read by a very large number in Europe and America. He intends this work "for the general reader who wishes to enlarge his spiritual environment rather than for the specialist." He envisages the teaching of the Gītā not as representing any sect of Hinduism, not even Hinduism as a whole but religion as such in its universality, without limit of time or space. It is with this object and attitude of mind that he has approached the Gītā and given his edition to the public. He has enriched

his book with apt quotations from Greek, Roman and Christian thinkers and mystics, thus revealing a marked similarity of thought and expression between them and the Gītā. Even in regard to the four-fold order of Hindu society mentioned in Verse 41 of Chapter 18, he makes an apt quotation from a modern author, Mr. Gerald Heard, from his book on 'Man the Master' wherein he emphasises a quadri-type organisation of society and observes that there have always been present in human community four types or strata of consciousness and that the sociological thought which first defined and named this four-fold structure of society is as much European as Indian.

Even the form of the poem as a Saṃvāda or dialogue between Kṛṣṇa, the Teacher, and Arjuna, the Pupil, can in his opinion be lifted from its local colouring and viewed as symbolic of the communion between the struggling soul and man's higher self, and the Battle of Kurukṣetra is as much within his body as outside. The modern mind can very well view the historical events connected with the origin of the poem from this perspective. For, he says. "The essential thing is truth or significance and historical fact is nothing more than the image of it". Even as regards the theory of Avatār upon which the Gītā is based, he points out that the westerner can well afford to believe it as "it is only an eloquent expression of the law of the spiritual world." He points out that one need not confine his belief to the only unique revelation. "If God is looked upon as the saviour of man, he must manifest himself whenever the forces of evil threaten to destroy human values."

In my opinion, the special value of Dr. Radhakrishnan's book consists in his interpretation of the teaching of the Gītā in its relation to modern thought and society. He firmly believes that "a re-statement of the truths of eternity in the accents of our time is the only way in which a great scripture can be of living value to mankind."

K. BALASUBRAHMANYA AIYAR.

OBITUARY

It is with great grief that we have to record here the premature passing away of one of our esteemed Life Members, Mr. Justice V. Govindarajachari, on 2-10-48. He was only 52 and had only been recently elevated to the Bench of the Madras High Court. He had gained the respect of all, both as an Advocate and as a Judge. Devout and cultured, he was an ardent supporter of the cause of Sanskrit learning.

THE JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH, MADRAS

Like the previous volumes of this Journal, the present part also shows the well known standard of Hindu Indology. ……………………We are grateful for the rich contents of this Journal.

—WALTER RUBEN in *Oriens*, VOL. I. No. 1.

OUR OWN PUBLICATIONS

No.	Publication	Rs.	A.	P.
1.	**Vibhrama-Viveka** of Maṇḍana Miśra—edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, M.A., I.E.S. (Retd.) and Vedāntālaṅkāra Prof. T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar, Sanskrit College, Mylapore, Madras ..	0	12	0
2.	**Vinavasavadatta** (an old Sanskrit drama), edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, M.A., I.E.S. (Retd.) and Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, M.A., D.Phil. (Oxon.), Reader in Sanskrit, University of Madras ..	0	8	0
3.	**Tolkappiyam** with an English translation, by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, M.A., L.T., Ph.D., Principal, Raja's College, Tiruvadi (Vol. I) ..	1	0	0
4.	**Tolkappiyam** Do. Do. Vol. II, Part 1 ..	2	0	0
5.	**History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil,** by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, M.A., L.T., Ph.D., Principal, Raja's College, Tiruvadi ..	6	0	0
6.	**Dhvanyaloka & Locana** of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta with Kaumudī by Uttuṅgodaya and Upalocana edited by Mahāmahopādhyāya Vidyāvācaspati S. Kuppuswami Sastriar, M.A., I.E.S. (Retd.), Sri T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar and Dr. T. R. Chintamani, M.A., Uddyota I ..	8	0	0
7.	The Kuppuswami Sastri Commemoration Volume ..	3	0	0
8.	Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit by Mahāmahopādhyāya Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri ..	2	0	0
9.	Compromises in the History of Vedanta by Mahāmahopādhyāya Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri ..	1	4	0
10.	The Primer of Indian Logic by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswamy Sastri ..	6	0	0

Copies can be had of: **The Secretaries,**

The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute,

Mylapore, MADRAS.

	Kuṟiñci Tiṇai	*Mullai*	*Neytal*	*Marutam*	*Pālai.*
Uṇā or food.	*aivaṉam.*	*varaku mutirai.*	Food got from the proceeds of salt and fish.	*nel*	Proceeds of decoity.
mā or beast.	*yāṉai, puli paṉṟi, karaṭi*	*māṉ muyal*	*karā cuṟā*	*erumai nīrnāy*	Emaciated *yāṉai, puli etc.*
maram or tree	*vēṅkai kōṅku*	*koṉṟai kuruntū etc.*	*Puṉṉai kaitai*	*marutū kāñci*	*iruppai kaḷḷi.*
puḷ or bird.	*mayil kiḷi.*	*kāṉaṅ-kōḻi*	*kaṭaṟ-kākkai*	*aṉṉam aṉṟil*	*paruntū eruvai*
paṟai or drum.	*Veṟiyāṭṭu-p-paṟai, toṇṭa-ka-p-paṟai*	*ēru-kōṭ paṟai*	*nāvāy-p-paṟai*	*nel-l-ari-paṟai*	*āṟal-ai-p-paṟai*
				cuṟaikoṇṭaparai.	
ceyti or profes-sion	*tēn-aḻittal*	*nirai mēytal*	*mīṉ-paṭuttal uppu-viḷaittal*	*uḻavau*	*āṟa-laittal*
yāḻ	*kuṟiñci*	*cātāri*	*cevvaḻi*	*marutam*	*pālai*
tiṇai-nilai-makkaṭ peyar	kuṟavaṉ *malai-nāṭaṉ verpaṉ*	*āyaṉ vēṭṭuvaṉ kurum-poraināṭaṉ*	*mulaiyaṉ cērppaṉ koṇkaṉ turaivaṉ*	*uḻavaṉ ūraṉ makiḻnaṉ*	*eyiṉaṉ mīḷi viṭalai.*

Will there be any overlapping among *karupporuḷ*?

20. எந்நில மருங்கிற் பூவும் புள்ளும்
அந்நிலம் பொழுதொடு வாரா வாயினும்
வந்த நிலத்தின் பயத்த வாகும்.

E-n-nila maruṅkiṟ pū-v-um puḷ-ḷ-um
A-n-nilam poḻutoṭu vārā v-āyiṉum
Vanta nilattiṉ payatta v-ākum.

Flowers and birds belonging to their respective tract and season, when described with reference to a different tract or season, have to be considered for the time being to belong to that tract and season.

Note: 1. *Nilattaṉ* is *upalakṣaṇa.* Hence *poḻutiṉ* also may be taken into account.

Note: 2. Though *pū* is not mentioned among *karupporuḷ* in the previous sūtra, it is considered so, since it forms a part of the tree mentioned there.

Note: 3. Iḷampūraṇar and Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar want to apply this with reference to other karupporuḷs also if they

are so found in Literature, the former by the *utti* '*vantatu koṇṭu vārātatu muṭittal*' and the latter by '*onṟeṉa muṭittal*'

How are the permanent residents of each *tiṇai* named?

21. பெயரும் வினையுமென் றாயிரு வகைய
திணைதொறு மரீஇய திணைநிலைப் பெயரே.

Peyar-um viṉai-y-um-eṉ ṟā-y-iru vakaiya
Tiṇai-toṟu marīiya tiṇai-nilai-p peyar-ē.

The names of the permanent residents with reference to each *tiṇai* are of two kinds: one taken from their family and the other from their profession.

Note: 1, The second line is taken by *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar* to mean the family name of each *tiṇai* and the name from the *uripporuḷ* of the same. Hence it has to be split into *tiṇai-toṟu-marīya peyarum and tiṇai-nilaip-peyarum.*

This construction is far-fetched; besides the idea conveyed by tiṇai-nilai-p-peyar is got by *kiḻavar* in the next *sūtra.*

Note: 2. *Tīṇai-nilai is ākupeyar* and means *tiṇai-nilai-makkaḷ.*

What are they?

22. ஆயர் வேட்டுவ ராடூஉத் திணைப்பெயர்
ஆவயின் வரூஉங் கிழவரு முளரே.

Āyar vēṭṭuva r-āṭū ut tiṇai-p-peyar
Ā-vayiṉ varūuṅ kiḻavar-u m-uḷar-ē.

The names of men are *āyar* and *vēṭṭuvar.* Among them there may be chieftains.

Note: 1. This sūtra refers to *mullai-t-tiṇai* alone in the opinion of *Iḷampūraṇar* and to *mullai* and *kuṟiñci* in the opinion of *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar.* This is to be understood only from tradition.

Note: 2. The meaning given by *Nācciṉārkkiṉiyar* is totally different. Among *āyar* and *vēṭṭuvar* there are chieftains both male and female. Since this sūtra should first of all give the names of the permanent residents, *Iḷampūraṇar's* interpretation alone is sound and straightforward.

Note: 3. *Āṭūuppeyar* and *kiḻavar* are *upalaksaṇa* to *makaṭūuppeyar* and *kiḻattiyar.*

Note: 4. *Āyaṉ* seems to be the family name in *mullai* and *vēṭṭuvaṉ* is the name by profession. This is suggested by the line in Iḷampūraṇam 'potuvaṉ āyaṉ eṉpaṉa kulampaṟṟi varum,' But this conflicts with his earlier sentence 'āyar

eṉpār nirai mēyppār.' *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar* thinks that *āyaṉ* and *vēṭṭuvaṉ* are respectively the *viṉai-p-peyar* of the residents of *mullai* and *kuṟiñci tiṇais.*

Are there *tiṇai-nilai-p-peyar* in other *tiṇais*?

23. ஏனோர் மருங்கினு மெண்ணுங் காலை
ஆனா வகைய திணை நிலைப்பெயரே

Ēṉōr maruṅkiṉum eṇṇuṅ kālai
Āṉā vakaiya tiṇai-nilai-p peyar-ē.

On examination, the names of the permanent residents of other *tiṇais* are of the same sort as in *mullai.*

Note: 1. *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyam* reads *pāṅkiṉum* for *maruṅkiṉum.*

Note: 2. *Āṉāvakaiya* is taken by *Iḷampūraṇar* to be made up of *āṉ+a-v-vakaiya* where *āṉ* means 'that place.' *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar* takes it to be made up of *āṉā+vakaiya* where *āṉā* means 'mostly.'

Note: 3. *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar* thinks this sūtra is concerned with *pālai* and *neytal,* since he has not come across such names with reference to *marutam.* But Iḷampūraṇar gives them.

Are compositions with slaves or servants as heroes and heroines sanctioned?

24. அடியோர் பாங்கினும் வினைவலர் பாங்கினும்
கடிவரை யிலபுறத் தென்மனார் புலவர்.

Aṭiyōr pāṅkiṉum viṉai-valar pāṅkiṉum
Kaṭivarai y-ila-puṟat t-eṉmaṉār pulavar.

Learned men say that *puṇartal, pirital* etc., are not avoided among slaves and servants, but they are outside the range of the five tiṇais mentioned. *i.e.* they belong to *kaikkiḷai* and *peruntiṇai.*

Note: 1. *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyam* reads *viṉai-vala* for *viṉai-valar*; but *viṉai-vala* seems to be a misprint.

Note: 2. The subject of *kaṭi-varai-y-ila,* according to commentators is 'composition of poems.' But it is better to take *puṇartal, pirital* etc. as the subject, since *ila* is plural.

Note: 3. From this sūtra it is evident that the heroes and heroines in *kaikkiḷai* and *peruntiṇai* are slaves and servants.

Can there be others also as heroes and heroines in *kaikkiḷai* and *peruntiṇai*?

25. ஏவன் மரபி னேனோரு முரியர்
ஆகிய நிலைமை யவரு மன்னர்.

Ēvaṉ marapi ṉ-ēṉōru m-uriyar
Ākiya nilamai-y-avaru m-aṉṉar.

Others also may be servants, when they may be the heroes and heroines of *kaikkiḷai* and *peruntiṇai.*

Note: 1. The same meaning is given by Iḷampūraṇar; but the method is different. He takes *kaikkiḷai - peruntiṇaikku* to be understood before *uriyar*; in that case, the second line in the sūtra is unnecessary.

Note: 2. The meaning given by *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar* is totally different. He thinks that this sūtra deals with the classification of *tiṇai-nilai-p-peyar* and they are of six kinds: *antaṇar, aracar, vaṇikar, kuṟunilamaṉṉar,* high Government officials and *vēḷāḷas.* There are three defects in this interpretation: (1) the *prakaraṇa* is about *kaikkiḷai* and *peruntiṇai* (2) the prose order adopted by him is curious: *marapiṉ ēval ākiya nilaimai-y-avarum, aṉṉār ākiya avarum, ēṉōrum, uriyar.* Besides *ēval ākiya* is taken to mean 'who are allowed to have servants' and the phrase *uri-p-poruḷ ātaṟkù* is taken to be understood before *uriyar.* (3) that others also who do menial service may be heroes in *kaikkiḷai* and *peruntiṇai* will have no sanction.

What may be the causes for *pirivu* or separation?

26. ஓதல் பகையே தூதிவை பிரிவே.

Ōtal pakai-y-ē tūt-ivai pirivē.

The causes of *pirivu* are study, enmity and embassy.

Note: 1. *Piruvu* is *ākupeyar* and means *piriviṉ nimittam*; *ivai* means 'these' i.e. these three: *Iḷampūraṇur* says that *ivai* means *ittaṉmai-ya* and *nimittam* is taken to be understood from the context.

Note: 2. *Pakai* evidently refers to enmity between kings, and chieftains.

Note: 3. Of the five *uripporuḷs*, the cause for all but *pirivu* is self-evident. Hence the author begins to tell this, having finished the enumeration of *mutaṟ-poruḷ, karupporuḷ* and *uripporuḷ.*

Note: 4. One should carefully note that this sūtra does not exhaust all the causes of *pirivu.*

Note: 5. *Naccinārkkiniyar* states that, since *pirivu* is common to both *kaḷavu* and *kaṟpu*, the author begins this sūtra.

Note: 6. In *Naccinārkkiniyam*, Damodaram Pillai's edition reads *ōtaṟku-p piritalum* and *tūtupaṟṟi-p-piritalum*, while Bhavanandam Pillai edition reads *ōtaṟ piritalum* and *tūtuṟṟu-p-piritalum.*

Note: 7. The phrase *antaṇarkkuriya* before 'ōtalum tūtum uṭaṉ kūṟiṟṟilar' in the Naccinārkkiṉiyam seems to be an interpolation.

Who are fit for *pirivu* on account of study and embassy?

அவற்றுள்

27. ஓதலுந் தூது முயர்ந்தோர் மேன.

Avaṟṟuḷ

Ōtal-un tūtu m-uyarntōr mēṉa.

Of them, *pirivu* for study and embassy is found among higher classes of men.

Note: 1. *Iḷampūraṇar* takes *antaṇar* and *aracar* under *uyarntōr* in this sūtra; but in two sūtras which follow where the word *uyarntōr* appears, he takes it to refer to *uyarntōr ākiya vaṇikar* and *antaṇar. Naccinārkkiṉiyar* takes it to refer to *antaṇar mutaliya mūvar, antaṉar aracar vaṇikar uyarnta vēḷāḷar,* and *uyarnta nālvakai varuṇattār* respectively. But it seems to me that in all the three sūtras it may refer to Brāhmans, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas.

Who are fit for *pirivu* on account of *pakai*?

28. தானே சேறலுந் தன்னொடு சிவணி
ஏனோர் சேறலும் வேந்தன் மேற்றே.

Tāṉ-e cēṟal-un taṉ-ṉ-oṭu civaṇi
Ēṉōr cēṟal-um vēntaṉ mēṟṟ-ē.

Going against (the enemy) in person or others accompanying him are found among kings.

Note: 1. *Cel-tal* transforms into *cēṟal* and *vēntaṉ-mēṟṟu* is the *oṉṟaṉpāl kuṟippuviṉai* formed from the compound noun *vēntaṉ-mēl.*

Note: 2. Naccinārkkiṉiyam reads *civaṇiya* for *civaṇi.*

Note: 3. *Ēṉōr* should refer to kings of other countries.

Are there any other causes for *pirivu*?

29. மேவிய சிறப்பி னேனோர் படிமைய
முல்லை முதலாச் சொல்லிய முறையாற்

பிழைத்தது பிழையா தாகல் வேண்டியும்
இழைத்த வொண்பொருள் முடியவும் பிரிவே.

Mēviya ciṟappi ṉ-ēṉōr paṭimaiya
Mullai mutal-ā-c colliya muṟaiyāṟ
Piḻaittatu piḻaiyā t-ākal vēṇṭiyum
Ilaitta v-oṉ-poruṇ muṭiya-v-um pirivē.

Separation may ensue on account of setting right the irregularities in temples having the idols of gods and among men of all tracts commencing with *mullai* mentioned before and on account of making immense wealth of finest type.

Note: 1. *Mēviya ciṟappiṉōr* are gods and men; *mēviya ciṟappiṉ ēṉōr* are those other than men, i.e. gods. *Paṭimaiya* means there 'those having the idols', *i.e,* temples. *colliya* means 'those people that are mentioned' and hence *ākupeyar*. These two are taken as the subject of the *viṉai-y-eccam piḻaittatu*. Muṟaiyāṉ is used in the sense of the fifth case and means 'from the prescribed code.'

Note 2. *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's* interpretation of this *sūtra* is totally different. It is this: *Pirivu* ensues from a king trying to set right the irregularities in the countries commencing with *mullai* which he got as tribute and from persons other than kings (i.e. Brāhmans and Vaiśyas) seeking after immense choice wealth mentioned in the Vedas. To arrive at this he adopts a peculiar prose order which appears to be far from natural. The meaning of *paṭimaiya* is, according to him, 'Vedas which prescribe the austerities.' The reason for such a laboured interpretation is his idea that this *sūtra* is connected with the previous one and has the substance of the sūtra '*Ōtal Kāval......*' of Iraiyanār Akapporul.

Who are competent to set right the irregularities in temples?

30. மேலோர் முறைமை நால்வர்க்கு முரித்தே
Mēlōr muṟaimai nālvarkku m-urittē.

The right of those mentioned first in the previous *sūtra* vests with all the four (*i.e.*) *Brāhmans, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas* and *Velālas*.

Note 1. Mēlōr is interpreted as 'devas' by *Iḷampūraṇar* and vaṇikar by *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar*. The meaning given by me to the word mēlōr (those that are mentioned first) agrees with that of mēlōr in the 3rd *sūtra* of the *Kaṟpiyal*.

Note 2. *Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar's* meaning is different. The code to earn wealth prescribed for *vaṇikar* holds good for *antaṇar, aracar* and two kinds of *vēlālar*. This meaning also seems to be far fetched.

Who are competent to set right the irregularities of people in different tracts?

31. மன்னர் பாங்கிற் பின்னோ ராகுப

Man̲n̲ar pāṅkir̲ pin̲n̲or-ākupa.

Pin̲n̲ōr (those mentioned next (i.e.) those to set right the irregularities of people) come under the class of kings (*i.e.*) Kṣatriyas.

Note 1. Pin̲n̲ōr here is similar to *Kīḻōr* in the 3rd *sūtra* of the *Kar̲piyal*. According to my meaning *pin̲n̲ōr* is *uddeśya* and *man̲n̲ar pāṅku* is *vidheya*. But according to *Ilampūraṇar* and *Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyar* they are reversed; *pin̲n̲ōr* means, according to the former, *vaṇikar* and *vēlālar* and according to the latter, *vēḷ-āḷar* alone.

Who are competent to make choice wealth?

32. உயர்ந்தோர்க் குரியவோத் தினான

Uyarntōrk k-uriya v-ōtti n̲-ān̲-a.

Separation on account of making choice wealth is allowable to the *uyarn̲tōr* in the way in which it is sanctioned in the Vedas.

Note 1. *Iḻaitta oṇ-poṇaṇ mu-ṭiya-p-pirivu* is taken here.

Note 2. Uyarntōr are those who were allowed to study the Vedas.

Note 3. The meanings given by *Ilampūranar* and *Naccīnārkkiniyar* are totally different. According to the former it is this:—*Vaṇikar* may have separation on account of study. According to the latter, *antaṇar, aracar, vaṇikar* and high class vēḷ-āḷar are competent to study the works in Sanskrit and Tamil which have their source in Vedas; here *ān̲a* is the subject and *uriya* is the predicate. Context does not seem to favour their interpretation.

Note 4. The *sūtras* 30, 31 and 32 are, in my opinion, the viśeṣa *sūtras* of the *sūtra* 29.

Are others allowed to carry over the duties of kings mentioned in *sūtras* 28 and 31?

33. வேந்துவினை யியற்கை வேந்த னொரீஇய
அேனோர் மருங்கினு மெய்திட னுடைத்தே

Vēntu-viṉai-iyaṟkai vēnta ṉ-orīiya
Eṉōr maruṅkiṉu m-eytiṭa ṉ-uṭaittē.

The nature of looking after the duties of kings is found even in men other than kings.

Note: 1. *Eṉōr* refers to the *kuṟu-nila-maṉṉar* or the chieftains of small territories.

Note 2. *Naccinārkkiṉiyam* reads *vēṉtaṉin* for *vēntaṉ*.

Note 3. *Ilampūranar* considers that this *sūtra* sanctions *tūtu* in *vaṇikar* and *vēḷālar* and hence ēṉōr, according to him, refers to them. This meaning does not appear to suit the context.

Note 4. This is a *viśeṣa sūtra* to the sūtras 27 to 31 with reference to Kṣatriyas. *Naccinārkkiṉiyar* holds about the same view.

Note 5. The particle *um* in *maruṅkiṉum* suggests that it is rare.

Are they entitled for *pirivu* to earn money ?

34. பொருள்வயிற் பிரிதலு மவர்வயி னுரித்தே

Poruḷ-vayiṟ pirital-u m-avar-vayi ṉ-uritte.

They are also entitled for *pirivu* on account of poruḷ.

Note 1. Avar here refers, according to *Ilampūraṇar*, to *vaṇikar* and *vēḷālar*.

Note 2. *Naccinārkkiṉiyar* takes this *sūtra* and the following one as one *sūtra* and thinks that it sanctions *pirivu* on account of *porul* and *ōtal* with reference to the *kuṟu-nila-maṉṉar*. Hence he takes oḻukkattāṉa porul to mean 'the study enjoined.'

If uyarntōr take to *pirivu*, on account of *porul*, what should they do?

35. உயர்ந்தோர் பொருள்வயி னொழுக்கத் தான.

Uyarntōr poruḷ-vayi ṉ-oḻukkat t-āṇ-a

If *uyarntōr* take to *pirivu* on account of *porul* they should stick to their ācāra or rules of conduct enjoined in *smṛtis*.

Note 1. *Pirital* is taken here from the previous *sūtra*.

Note 2. This is a *viśeṣa-vidhi* to the *sūtra* 32. The *uddeśya* is *porul-vayiṟ-pirital* and the *vidheya* is *oḻukkattiṉkaṇ iruttal*. The substance of this *sūtra* is that, though *uyarntōr* have to go to foreign countries to make money, they should stick to their *ācāras*. Since *pirivu* in *kaḷavu* is of two

त्रिविधेनाम्बुवाद्येन क्रीडया चाष्टमार्गया ।
मधुरैः करणैस्तस्मिन् स रेमे रमणीसखः ॥ १४ ॥

क्रीडान्ते स कृतस्नानः पूजितप्रियदैवतः ।
त्रयोदशविधैः सिद्धं संस्कारैः शोधनादिभिः ॥ १५ ॥

भुक्त्वा पञ्चविधं भोज्यमात्मसात्म्यो[1]चितं ततः ।
भुक्त्वास्थानगतः शेषं निनाय ससुहृद्दिनम् ॥ १६ ॥

ततोऽतिरागिण्यर्के च प्रतीचीमुखचुम्बिनि ।
निशामपि विशालाक्षीविधेयहृदयोऽनयत् ॥ १७ ॥

ततस्तटिल्लताकल्पा स्फुटत्कुटजमालिनी ।
प्रावृट् प्रादुरभूत् तस्य मयू[2]राराविणी पुरः ॥ १८ ॥

जडिमानं जलार्द्रस्य कदम्बमुकुलस्पृशः ।
निनाय वायोर्नारीणामुरोजकलशोष्मणा ॥ १९ ॥

ततः कुमुदकल्हारपद्मबन्धुनभस्वति ।
काले शुककुलालीढशालिशालिनि शारदे ॥ २० ॥

मणिहर्म्यतले रम्ये विशदप्रतिमेन्दुनि ।
पाययन् परमानन्दं प्रपेदे मदिरां प्रियाम् ॥ २१ ॥

अथाशेषाम्बुजद्वेषी विसारी हिमशीकरैः ।
प्रशान्तरविसन्तापो हेमन्तः समजृम्भत ॥ २२ ॥

हैमनेषु दिनेष्वेवं विस्मृतान्यविभूतिषु ।
रेमे रामाविधेयात्मा निशान्ते शान्तविश्रमः ॥ २३ ॥

अथैनमतिदुःस्पर्शस्पर्शनः शिशिरागमः ।
हेमन्तातिशयो वृद्धनीहारसुहृदाययौ ॥ २४ ॥

प्रबुद्धलोध्रवासन्तीकुन्दप्रसवरेणुभिः ।
चित्रयन् दयितावक्त्रं चिक्रीड शिशिरागमे ॥ २५ ॥

इत्थं यथर्तुव्यापारैरनुभूय प्रियामिव ।
ऋतुलक्ष्मीमपि क्ष्मापः प्रपेदे स परां मुदम् ॥ २६ ॥

---

1. त्मो. ख. ग. 2. धु. क.

ततस्तामतितेजस्वीव्यञ्जकस्वप्नदो[1]हदाम् ।
अन्तर्वत्नीं वसुमतीं स शुश्राव सखीमुखात् ॥ २७ ॥

नृपनिर्वर्तितानेकव्योमक्रीडादिदौहृदा ।
आसन्नप्रसवां वेलामाजगाम क्रमेण सा ॥ २८ ॥

ततः कतिपयामात्यं प्रवृद्धानन्दमेकदा ।
भुक्त्वास्थानगमभ्येत्य प्रतीहारी व्यजिज्ञपत् ॥ २९ ॥

देव ! द्वारि स्थितः कोऽपि देवदर्शनदोहली ।
मस्करीति ततो राज्ञः प्रावेशयदनुज्ञया ॥ ३० ॥

गृहीतयोगसंभारं नियमक्षामविग्रहम् ।
दृष्ट्वा मस्करिणं तस्मै वेत्रासनमदर्शयत् ॥ ३१ ॥

उपह्वरे सहामात्यैस्तदागमनकारणम् ।
अथापृच्छत् परिव्राजं राजा स च तमभ्यधात् ॥ ३२ ॥

विदितं नाम देवस्य यथाहं भवदाज्ञया ।
एवंलिङ्गी वसाम्येष मालवेषु तदीश्वरः ॥ ३३ ॥

मानसारो रणे मूर्ध्नि चरणाक्रमणेन ते ।
अमर्षादतिदुःसाधं तप्तुं व्यवसितस्तपः ॥ ३४ ॥

अवमानोष्ण(म)सन्तापादसहिष्णुश्चिरायितुम् ।
अनासन्नफलात् तस्मान्निवृत्य तपसो हि सः ॥ ३५ ॥

महाकाले महामांसविक्रयेण महेश्वरम् ।
आराधयन्नसिवरं प्रापाप्रतिहतं क्वचित् ॥ ३६ ॥

तत्सहायात् सहास्माभिरभियाति युयुत्सया ।
इति श्रुत्वा परं देवः प्रमेति विरराम सः ॥ ३७ ॥

आकर्ण्य तदजय्यं तमाकलय्य रिपुं नृपः ।
जीवितव्यय एवात्र श्रेयानित्यकरोन्मतिम् ॥ ३८ ॥

ततः सुमतिनामास्य मन्त्री वचनमब्रवीत् ।
देव ! मैवं कृथाः सन्तो न प्रशंसन्ति साहसम् ॥ ३९ ॥

1. दौहदात् . ग.

शस्त्रग्रहणदक्षे तु शत्रावत्र द्वयी गतिः ।
तदाश्रयो वनं वेति निरपायो वनाश्रयः ॥ ४० ॥

देशे काले जयो वा स्यादात्मा सर्वात्मनापि च ।
रक्ष्य इत्येतमेवान्येऽप्यन्वमन्यन्त मन्त्रिणः ॥ ४१ ॥

तच्छ्रुत्वा सत्त्वसंपन्नः स्वच्छान्तःकरणान्नृपः ।
अतिगम्भीरमाचष्ट स्पष्टार्थमधुरं वचः ॥ ४२ ॥

असारः खलु संसारः शरीरमतिभङ्गुरम् ।
मरणेन रणे लभ्यमासंसारस्थिरं यशः ॥ ४३ ॥

तदिमं भूतसङ्घातमुत्सृज्य रणमूर्धनि ।
यशोमयमिहाशासे दिवि तेजोमयं वपुः ॥ ४४ ॥

न च पश्यामि नः शेषं कृत्येष्वन्यत्र सन्ततेः ।
अत्रानुभाववान् देव्या गर्भ इत्यनुमीयते ॥ ४५ ॥

इत्थं निश्चलसङ्कल्पं जानन्नपि जनेश्वरम् ।
प्रणयेन पुनर्वाणीममात्यः प्रत्यभाषत ॥ ४६ ॥

देव! जीवितमिच्छन्ति कातरा एव नेतरे ।
सारेतरश्च संसारः श्रेय एव यशो नृणाम् ॥ ४७ ॥

खलाभिलाषिणी चेयं लक्ष्मीः क्षणपलायिनी ।
पादक्षतेव धत्ते न क्वचिदप्यचलं पदम् ॥ ४८ ॥

अस्याश्चापलवार्तायां दीपज्वालापि लज्जते ।
तदप्येनां वशे कर्तुं प्रभवन्ति भवादृशाः ॥ ४९ ॥

बिसतन्तुनिविष्टोऽपि श्रियमाप शतक्रतुः ।
कलिध्वस्तोऽपि कालेन प्राप्तराज्यो हि नैषधः ॥ ५० ॥

अन्ये च खलु राजन्या विषमस्खलितां श्रियम् ।
उपायैरधिगच्छन्तो बभूवुर्बहवो भुवि ॥ ५१ ॥

प्रतिपालय शैलान्ते कालं मा खलु साहसम् ।
इत्युक्त्वा चरणाभ्यर्णे स पपात कृताञ्जलिः ॥ ५२ ॥

अथैनमथमुत्थाप्य प्रथनप्रवणाशयः ।
नराधिपः स्मितं कुर्वन्नुदारतरमब्रवीत् ॥ ५३ ॥

मरणं रमणीयं मे रणवर्जितजीवनात् ।
वने वा नानुबध्नीयात् किममर्षपरो रिपुः ॥ ५४ ॥

भवद्भिस्तदिमां देवीमादाय सपरिच्छदाम् ।
दुर्गं विन्ध्यवनं गत्वा स्थातव्यं विगतव्यथैः ॥ ५५ ॥

रणयज्ञाङ्गणे प्राणान् परित्यक्ष्यामि दक्षिणाम् ।
अन्यथाहं विनङ्क्ष्यामि ज्वलदर्चिषि पावके ॥ ५६ ॥

[1]अलं बहुविधैरस्माननुरुध्य वृथोदितैः ।
वीरव्रतमहं त्यक्तुं पारयामि न सङ्गरे ॥ ५७ ॥

इत्यनुत्तरमन्येषामत्युदारमुदीरयन् ।
सत्यसन्धो महीपालः प्रत्यपालयदाहवम् ॥ ५८ ॥

अनिवर्त्यममी [2]भर्तुर्व्यवसायमनिच्छया ।
कृच्छ्रादभ्युपगच्छन्तस्तामादाय वनं ययुः ॥ ५९ ॥

अथाश्चर्याण्यवर्तन्त घोररूपाणि सर्वतः ।
दुर्निमित्तानि भूकम्पप्रभृतीनि धराभृताम् ॥ ६० ॥

तानि दृष्ट्वापि हृष्टेषु रणोद्युक्तेषु राजसु ।
प्रहितो मालवेन्द्रेण ब्राह्मणः कोऽप्युपाययौ ॥ ६१ ॥

अथानुरूपं भूभर्त्रा पूजितस्तदनुज्ञया ।
स्तुतिपूर्वं रिपोर्वाचं व्याजहार वचोहरः[3] ॥ ६२ ॥

मन्मुखेन महाभागमित्यूचे मालवेश्वरः ।
वीर! प्रीत्यनुवृत्त्या त्वय्यधिकस्नेहवानहम् ॥ ६३ ॥

अनन्यसुलभश्रीमद्विक्रमक्रमशालिने ।
स्पृहयाम्याहवे नित्यं भुजविस्फूर्जिताय ते ॥ ६४ ॥

त्वद्विक्रमरसास्वादी चरणस्पर्शपांसुलान् ।
त्यक्त्वा प्राणान् रणे स्वैरं दिव्यस्त्रीभिरथारमे ॥ ६५ ॥

---

1. ग. omits the verse 2. कर्तुः. ग. 3. रहः. ग.

पुरा च परितप्तोऽस्मि प्रधनादपयानतः ।
तदद्य कृतसन्नाहावाहवायारभावहे ॥ ६६ ॥

इति श्रुत्वोर्जितां वाचं प्रत्यूचे मगधेश्वरः ।
बाढमस्तु प्रियं मे स्याद्युद्धार्थी यदि मालवः ॥ ६७ ॥

प्रयागभुवि पुण्यायां प्रग एवास्तु सङ्गमः ।
अप्रशस्तमहः कामं तत्परीक्षा जयैषिणाम् ॥ ६८ ॥

तदद्यैव बलोद्योगः क्रियतामिति भूपतिः ।
बलाधिकृतमादिश्य [1]प्रतिमुच्य वचोहरम् ॥ ६९ ॥

ललितभ्रूलतादेशप्रोज्झिताखिलराजकः ।
ससंभ्रमजनात्तस्मादुत्थायाभ्यन्तरं ययौ ॥ ७० ॥

तत्र चित्राणि रत्नानि बहुलानि वसूनि च ।
विविधानि च वासांसि विप्रसादकरोदसौ ॥ ७१ ॥

ततो बहुविधाः शृण्वन् पुण्या विप्रजनाशिषः ।
कृतप्रास्थानिकः स्थानान्निर्जगाम जनेश्वरः ॥ ७२ ॥

प्रयाणपटहध्वानक्षुभितस्थगितान्तरः ।
प्रलयार्णवसङ्काशः ससार बलसागरः ॥ ७३ ॥

तराङ्गितं तुरङ्गौघैर्विचित्रगतिविभ्रमैः ।
क्वचिदाश्रितमुद्भ्रान्तैः शैलोच्चयनिभैरिभैः ॥ ७४ ॥

रथनेमिप्रतिध्वानैर्मथनायितमन्यतः ।
बहुव्यालैः पदातीनां करवालैः करालितम् ॥ ७५ ॥

जगाहे जनसंबाधैरगाधं मगधेश्वरः ।
कटकं कैटभारातिर्वराह इव वारिधिम् ॥ ७६ ॥

अथानैषीदहःशेषं बलदर्शनलीलया ।
निशामपि नृपैः सार्धं कथया रणबद्धया ॥ ७७ ॥

प्रभाते कृतपुण्याहकलशस्नानमङ्गलः ।
स्तूयमानो ययौ योद्धुं मागधैर्मगधेश्वरः ॥ ७८ ॥

1. प्रस्थाप्य च. ग

हेमकूटाख्यमारूढो हस्तिरत्नमनुत्तमम् ।
यत्सहाय[1]स्त्वयं मेने जय्यमेव जगत्त्रयम् ॥ ७९ ॥

ततश्चतुर्विधैरङ्गैरुभयोरपि सेनयोः ।
अकालप्रलयाकारः स बभूव समागमः ॥ ८० ॥

क्रमेण च रजोराशौ प्रशान्ते गगनस्पृशि ।
युयुधाते कृतस्पर्धौ मुहुर्मागधमालवौ ॥ ८१ ॥

अतिभारतमत्युग्रमतिरामायणं रणम् ।
यद् बभूव तयोस्तस्माद् दूरे तारामयाद्यपि ॥ ८२ ॥

मालवेन्द्रगजे भग्ने हेमकूटेन तत्क्षणम् ।
वैरबद्धावयुध्येतां तुरगद्वयवर्तिनौ ॥ ८३ ॥

हते हयद्वये तस्मिन् निवर्त्य रथवर्तिनौ ।
उभावपि कृतोत्साहौ न तौ जेतुमशक्नुताम् ॥ ८४ ॥

मानसारस्ततो मानी चिन्तयन्नन्तकद्विषम् ।
तत्प्रसा[2]दाहृतं खड्गं चिक्षेप मगधेश्वरे ॥ ८५ ॥

तमेष लवशः कुर्वन्नपि शर्वप्रभावतः ।
प्रहृतो जगृहे कीर्त्या त्रैलोक्ये हृदि मूर्छया ॥ ८६ ॥

हत्वा सूतं गते तस्मिन्नन्तर्धानमनन्तरम् ।
शस्त्रक्षत इवाम्भोधौ पपात च विरोचनः ॥ ८७ ॥

नृपाचित्त इवात्युग्रे तमोराशौ तमीमुखे ।
हतसारथिमुद्भ्रान्ता विनिन्युस्तुरगा रथम् ॥ ८८ ॥

अतिलङ्घ्य बहून् देशान् कुहचिद् विन्ध्यगह्वरे ।
असह्यश्रमवैवश्या विजहुर्जीवितं हयाः ॥ ८९ ॥

लब्धसंज्ञः सुमत्यादीन् प्रत्यभिज्ञाय जल्पतः ।
आलापमशृणोदेषां गुल्मान्तरितमित्यसौ ॥ ९० ॥

आर्याः शृणुत निक्षिप्ता राज्ञा सन्ततिरक्षणे ।
वयं खलु सुतं देवी प्रासूत च सुलक्षणम् ॥ ९१ ॥

---

1. स्व. ग.   2. भावागतम्. क.

तस्यैकादशमद्याहः कृतमङ्गलसंज्ञकम्[1] ।
उपास्महे महाभागं वयं चार्भकसेवया ॥ ९२ ॥

[2]स्वप्ने च खेचरेणाहं नीयमानं कुमारकम् ।
दृष्टवानस्मि कष्टाय[3] दुर्निमित्तपरम्परा ॥ ९३ ॥

इत्युक्तमात्रे तत्रासीन्नीतः केनापि बालकः ।
हंसरूपेण पुंसेति स्त्रैणाक्रन्दरवो महान् ॥ ९४ ॥

हाहाकृति जने राज्ञी विलप्य बहु विह्वला ।
कुमारहरणोद्विग्नानमात्यानित्यभाषत ॥ ९५ ॥

साहं खलु महाराजशासनात् प्रसवावधि ।
आराधयितुमानीतास्म्यवन्ध्यां विन्ध्यवासिनीम् ॥ ९६ ॥

तत्र चैवमपुण्याया नष्टः खलु कुमारकः ।
दुःखदग्धमिमं देहं त्यक्ष्यामि वनपावके ॥ ९७ ॥

आर्यपुत्राय नेतव्यो युष्माभिरयमञ्जलिः ।
इत्युदीरितसङ्कल्पां प्रत्यवोचत सुश्रुतः ॥ ९८ ॥

अविषह्यतमः शोको यदि सत्यमिदं भवेत् ।
तथालक्षणसम्पन्नः कथं नश्येत् स बालकः ॥ ९९ ॥

अमानुषतया छन्नोऽप्यात्मानं दुर्गयत्यसौ ।
तदवैपश्चितीं बुद्धिं मा त्वं प्राकृतवत् कृथाः ॥ १०० ॥

तथोक्ता निशि गाढायां निगूढव्यवसायिनी ।
यत्रास्ते नृपतिस्तास्मिन्नुद्बन्धनधिया ययौ ॥ १०१ ॥

स्त्रीभावादार्यपुत्रेति प्रलपन्तीं प्रियां नृपः ।
[4]उपवीक्ष्यास्फुटां वाचं मा साहसमिति व्यधात् ॥ १०२ ॥

श्रुत्वा पत्युरिवारावं दत्तदृष्टिः किमप्यसौ ।
दृष्ट्वा दीप इति व्यक्तं व्याजहार मुहुर्भिया॥ १०३ ॥

ततो दीपप्रभाव्यक्तरुधिरोक्षितविग्रहम् ।
मृतकल्पमपश्यत्तं शयानं भूतले पतिम् ॥ १०४ ॥

---

1. सांस्क्रियम्. क.
2. सुप्ते. ग.
3. कष्टा च. ग.
4. उपलक्ष्य. ग.

लतेव चलिता भूमौ पपात पतिदर्शिनी ।
स तेषां द्विगुणीकुर्वन् पूर्वदुःखार्णवोऽभवत् ॥ १०५ ॥

प्राणत्यागप्रणयिनि जने मागधानामधीश-
स्त्यक्ताशेषव्यथ इव दृशावुन्मिमीलोल्लसन्त्यौ ।
नीत्वा राज्ञीं ज्वलनमुखतस्तूर्णमश्रद्दधानां
प्राप्तानन्दाः प्रसभमथ ते सर्व एवोपतस्थुः ॥ १०६ ॥

इत्यवन्तिसुन्दरीकथासारे
द्वितीयः परिच्छेदः ॥

॥ अथ तृतीयः परिच्छेदः ॥

अथात्मनो यथावृत्तं निवेद्य स्वस्थवन्नृपः ।
प्रहर्षोपस्थितान् सर्वानमात्यानित्यभाषत ॥ १ ॥

देवीमरणपर्यन्तं भवद्वृत्तान्तमप्यहम् ।
जानाम्येवंगतः सोऽहं प्रत्याश्वस्तः पिनाकिना ॥ २ ॥

आविर्भूयावदद्देवः प्रसन्नः सन्नमानसम् ।
मनसैव कथञ्चिन्मां नमस्यन्तं पुरान्तकः ॥ ३ ॥

अहमेवासिरूपेण क्षिप्तः शकलितस्त्वया ।
अमानुषप्रभावत्वात् प्रीतः प्रत्यक्षमेयिवान् ॥ ४ ॥

नीतो नक्तंदिवेनाश्वैर्बह्वन्तरमिहैव च ।
मत्प्रभावेण भूयः स्वां प्रकृतिं च गमिष्यसि ॥ ५ ॥

अचिन्त्यबलसम्पन्नो जम्बूद्वीपैकनायकः ।
महानुभावः पुत्रस्ते भविता राजवाहनः ॥ ६ ॥

स पुनः षोडशे वर्षे दिग्जयाय विसृज्यताम् ।
इतरश्च कुमारस्ते कुशली हंसवाहनः ॥ ७ ॥

न्यस्तशस्त्रेण कस्मिंश्चिद्वस्तव्यं च त्वयाश्रमे ।
इत्युक्त्वान्तर्दधे[1] देवः प्रोत्थितश्चास्मि निर्व्यथः ॥ ८ ॥

तच्छ्रुत्वा सर्व एवोचुः प्रसन्नस्ते पिनाकधृक् ।
वयं चानुगृहीताः स्मः प्रसन्ना विन्ध्यवासिनी ॥ ९ ॥

1. अन्तर्गतो. ग.

SELECT OPINIONS

Hermann Jacobi, Professor of Sanskrit, University of Bonn, 14th December, 1926.—I have perused your new Journal of Oriental Research with great interest. I heartily wish you success in your meritorious undertaking.

L. D. Barnett, School of Oriental Studies, London, 19th December, 1926.—It seems to me to be a good beginning to the enterprise which I hope will be very successful. Some of the matter is very good indeed.

J. Jolly, Wurzburg, Germany, 20th December, 1926.—This evidently is a periodical of great promise, with every chance of success.

Q. Strauss, Professor of Sanskrit, Kiel University, 1st January, 1927.—Being very well pleased with the first number of your Journal of Oriental Research I ask you to enrol me as a subscriber.

Sir Richard Temple, Editor, Indian Antiquary, London, 6th January, 1927.—Your excellent Issue.

F. O. Schrader, Kiel, 9th January, 1927.—I have read with absorbing interest through the first number and find its contents quite satisfactory.......... A Journal of this kind has been undoubtedly a need in Madras since long.

Dr. Wilhelm Printz, Librarian, D. M. G. Halle, 14th January, 1927.—......This fascicle contains many very interesting and scholarly articles: a very pretty start!

"Bombay Chronicle." 12th December, 1926.—................ The Quality of scholarship displayed is of a high order.

"Indian Review." November, 1927.—We welcome this new Quarterly of Oriental Research..................The influence of Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastri, the Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Presidency College, has been ceaselessly exercised in furthering the cause of such learning........

"New India," 20th December, 1926.—.............The design and the get-up of the Journal is very good, and we recommend the Journal to all lovers of research and scholarship.

"Hindu," 9th Feburary, 1927.—............The Journal will not merely maintain the high level reached in its first number but frequently transcend itself.

"Madras Mail," 21st January, 1927.—................The contributions are from persons who have specialised in particular branches and show striking evidence of original work....

Dr. Sylvain Levi, Paris.—......It deals with so many sides of Indian Science, and in such an interesting way. What I like most in it, is its genuine and regular Indian flavour, its proper 'Rasa'. Many of your contributors, if not all of them, know how to combine Pandit-learning and Western standards.

Dr. H. Luders, Berlin University.—..........I was greatly impressed with the high standard of scholarship, the orginality of thought and the soundness of critical methods displayed in your contributions.....

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE, MADRAS

GOVERNING BODY

PRESIDENT:

Sri T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, C.I.E.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer, LL.D., K.C.I.E.
Sir S. Radhakrishnan.
Dr. Sir A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, LL.D., D.SC.

TRUSTEES:

Rao Bahadur K. V. Krishnaswami Iyer, B.A., B.L.
Rao Bahadur A. A. Venkatarama Iyer.

TREASURER:

Sri M. Subbaraya Iyer, B.A., B.L.

MEMBERS:

Rao Bahadur G. A. Natesan.
Rao Bahadur Prof. D. S. Sarma.
Dewan Bahadur K. S. Ramaswami Sastri.
Prof. P. N. Srinivasachariar.
Sri N. Raghunathan.
Sri Prof. T. Chandrasekharan, M.A., L.T.

SECRETARIES:

Sri K. Balasubrahmanya Iyer, B.A., B.L.
Sri Prof. A. Shanmuga Mudaliar, M.A.
Sri Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A. PH.D.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN:

Prof. M. Hiriyanna.

VICE-CHAIRMAN:

Prof. K. A. Nilakantha Sastri.

MEMBERS:

Rao Sahib S. Vaiyapuri Pillai.
Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, M.A., PH.D.
Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, M.A., D.PHIL.
Dr. A. Sankaran, M.A., PH.D.
Prof. V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, M.A.

EX-OFFICIO:

Sri K. Balasubrahmanya Iyer, B.A., B.L.
Sri Prof. A. Shanmuga Mudaliar, M.A.
Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., PH.D. (*Correspondent for the Journal*).

All Communications should be addressed to the Correspondent, Journal of Oriental Research, Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Mylapore, Madras.

PRINTED BY N. RAMARATNAM, M.A., B.L., AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS
55 & 56 MUNDAKANNI AMMAN KOIL STREET, MYLAPORE, MADRAS.—MS. 76.
PUBLISHED BY K. BALASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR, KSRI., MYLAPORE, MADRAS.—MS. 394.